Brit.
4279

Parnell (Will)

AN

HISTORICAL APOLOGY

FOR THE

Irish Catholics.

By WILLIAM PARNELL, Esq.

SECOND EDITION,

WITH ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

DUBLIN:

H. FITZPATRICK,

CAPEL STREET,

1807.

59

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

TO THE

DUKE OF BEDFORD.

My Lord,

In inscribing this work to your Grace, it is with difficulty that I suppress those sentiments of private esteem, which if I were to give them utterance, would appear more warm than the occasion would justify.

I confine myself to the expression of that gratitude for your Grace's wise and conciliating Administration, and that regret for its termination, which I feel in common with every Irishman.

Avondale,
April, 1807.

W. PARNELL.

PREFACE.

THIS little work was written with no view of promoting party interests, nor from any consideration of the circumstances of the day, but with the humble hope that it might afford some instruction on those general topics of political science, which have at all times sufficient importance to deserve attention.

The Author makes no apology for literary defects, which he has not been very anxious to avoid; he is not exposed to the ridicule of failure in a point where he has attempted nothing.

His sole object has been to produce conviction; his motive—to give security to every Irishman in his Person and Property, both of which must be exposed to risk, as long as any civil distinctions are inflicted on so numerous a body as the Irish Roman Catholics.

In point of historical proofs, he has not been unfaithful from the want of anxiety to avoid being so: In principle, he has certainly not been partial to the Catholics; as he has quoted entirely from Protestant writers; and if he has fallen into any misrepresentation in the detail, it must be considered, that in bringing so many proofs, in exposing so large a surface, it is difficult, with the best intentions, not to have left

much

much liable to cavil, and something perhaps to merited reprehension.

Yet, as he never will enter into literary controversy, he is anxious to anticipate some sources of misrepresentation which he foresees, and which would be peculiarly unjust, as they would receive countenance from the very care he has taken to be correct.

He has always quoted from the earliest authorities, and when possible, from eye-witnesses; whereas an opponent might quote, in contradiction, from later and more bigoted authorities, and yet derive credit; because the sources of Irish History exist in such obscurity, that the public would regard the earlier and later authorities without any preference.

Thus, in many instances, where he has quoted from Fynes Moryson, and Sir George Carew, who were eye-witnesses of the events they describe, a plausible contradiction might be produced from the authority of Sir R. Cox, although he wrote much later, and derived his information respecting the events of these times, from Moryson and Sir George Carew themselves.

Thus, the Author has produced the authority of Sir J. Davis, for his description of the Brehon laws of property; as Sir J. Davis was alive at the time those laws existed; and yet the authority of Sir James Ware, might be produced to contradict this description, and might influence those who do not know that Sir James Ware wrote,

wrote long after Sir J. Davis, and when the old laws and customs of the Irish had fallen into obscurity.

He is aware that many people will take offence at the sincere and strong terms of reprobation with which he has marked the conduct of the English Government in Ireland; but, unless we should see that conduct again adopted, the censure will scarcely be applied by any one to the present times.

On the contrary, he hopes the description he has given, will serve as a contrast, to make the blessings of an improved government more dear to the feelings of the Irish nation.

He has drawn a picture in which the distant view is gloomy and dark; but the vast ruins, the desolated landscape, and the storm, passing sullenly away, will give more brilliancy to the scenes of peace and happiness, with which the pencil of the future historian may enrich the foreground.

Religious concord will not always be banished from Ireland.

The cause of the Irish Catholics rests not only on the clear dictates of reason, justice, and humanity, but on very imperious demands of policy.

It is true it has two very formidable opponents; dullness and malignity: but as stupidity perplexes the efforts of rancour, and ill-nature makes folly odious; the opposition to the Catholic claims will become ineffectual in the progress of its own exertions.

If

If it is true that the Catholics have thrown impediments in their own way; if, notwithstanding their general good sense, they have exposed themselves to the charge of intemperance, it has arisen from being placed at so great a distance from the seat of of political action, that it is al most impossible to form a just and clear judgment of passing events. They must necessarily see through an intervening medium, which may often present objects in a false point of view.

The Protestants, who felt all the danger of the delicate situation in which the Catholics were placed, with so much to wound their feelings, to inflame their resentments and precipitate their measures, cannot be too grateful for their late disinterested forbearance; and must rejoice that, at the time so great a shock was given to their just and honourable expectations, they met with a friend so sincere, and an adviser so judicious as Lord Ponsonby.

If the Author might also obtrude his advice to the Catholics, although he is sensible there is very little occasion for it, it would be contained in one short maxim: "Be angry, and sin not."

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

HISTORICAL APOLOGY

FOR THE

Irish Catholics.

THE pleaſure which is derived from accurate and concluſive argument, is ſtill farther encreaſed when each link of reaſoning has its ſeparate ſupport in appropriate and ſtriking facts; and it is exalted to the higheſt degree which can affect a refined and humane mind, when the theory and facts produce a concluſion in which the benevolent and gentle feelings may deeply ſympathize.

An argument may be correct, but it will never be really intereſting if deficient in ſtriking facts, or if its concluſions are repugnant to the amiable ſentiments of the heart.

This appears to be the reaſon why metaphyſical ſpeculations have never become generally intereſt-

ing; becauſe, from the nature of the ſubject, the facts which ſupport them are ſcanty and trite.

In the ſame manner, when Buffon produces a ſeries of very curious facts to prove the exiſtence of blunder, defect and malignity, in place of ſkilful and benevolent contrivance in the plan of created beings, we feel no pleaſure in the melancholy diſcovery, and take no intereſt in the triumph of the pragmatical naturaliſt.

The following argument in favour of the Iriſh Catholics, has ſo far a right to ſome claim on the public attention; the facts which ſupport it are new and ſtriking, and its reſult is favourable to the moderate and benevolent affections.

The general concluſion which we ſhall attempt to prove, is ſimply this: That religious ſentiments, however perverted by bigotry or fanaticiſm, has always a tendency to moderation, if not indifference; that it ſeldom aſſumes any great portion of activity or enthuſiaſm, except from novelty of opinion, or from oppoſition, contumely and perſecution, when novelty ceaſes: That a government has little to fear from any religious ſect, except while the ſect is new; give a government only time, and provided it has the good ſenſe to treat folly with forbearance, it muſt ultimately prevail. When, therefore, we find a ſect, after a long lapſe of years ill-diſpoſed to the government, we may be certain that government has

has protracted its union by marked diſtinctions, has rouſed its reſentment by contumely, or ſupported its enthuſiaſm by perſecution.

The particular concluſion we ſhall attempt to prove, is, that the Catholic religion, in Ireland, had ſunk into torpor and inactivity, till government rouſed it with the laſh; that even then from the reſpect and attachment which men are always inclined to pay to government, there ſtill remained a large body of loyal Catholics, that theſe only decreaſed in number from the rapid encreaſe of perſecution; and that after all, the effect which the reſentment of the Roman Catholics had in creating rebellions, has been very much exaggerated.

On theſe grounds we cloſe with the adverſaries of the Catholic claims. *They* ſay, it is the nature of the religion which makes the Catholics diſaffected, and therefore the religion muſt be ſuppreſſed. *We* ſay, that even allowing that the principle of the religion is bad, ſtill, that if it were left alone, it would become indolent and innocuous; that it is the principle of perſecution adopted againſt the religion which makes the Catholics zealous and diſaffected, and that therefore the perſecution ſhould be dropped.

It is difficult to know whether the facts that are to be produced in ſupport of this opinion, will bring conviction to the mind of the reader, but at all events they are neither trite nor unimportant.

The firſt difficult fact thoſe writers (who attribute Iriſh rebellions ſolely to the antipathy of Catholics to a Proteſtant government) have to encounter, is, that they were juſt as frequent while the government was Catholic, as when it became Proteſtant; and that the moſt formidable rebellion which ever ſhook the Engliſh power in Ireland, broke out thirty years *before* the reformation, and continued with little intermiſſion, until the æra of the reformation.

In the reign of Henry VII. 1504, a general confederation of the Iriſh princes took place, headed by Ulrick Burke, Turloh O'Brien, Melrony O'Carol, &c. &c. who collected the greateſt army that had been in Ireland ſince the conqueſt. They fought a bloody and hard conteſted battle with the Lord Deputy Kildare, at Knocklow, in Connaught.

In Henry VIII.'s reign, *before* the reformation, the Engliſh were defeated at Monetrar, by an army under the command of the Earl of Deſmond's ſon, Tirlagh O'Brien, and M'William. (Ann. 1510.)

In the year 1513, M'William took the Caſtle of Dunluſe, and we read that "the Iriſh met with very little oppoſition this winter: they ravaged the country as they pleaſed, but that they paid dear for it next Spring."

In 1514, we find the Deputy attacking the Iriſh chieftains, O'Moore and O'Reyly.

In

In 1516, the Deputy ſlew Shane O'Tuathal, beſieged Lemevan Caſtle, took Clonmel, invaded Ulſter, took the Caſtle of Dundrum, conquered Fylemy M'Gennis, and (as it was technically termed in thoſe days) *preyed* Tyrone. The citizens of Dublin were likewiſe defeated in Imale.

In 1519, Con. O'Nial invaded Meath.

In 1521, we find mention of the Byrnes being in rebellion.

The ſame year a confederate army of the O'Mordris, O'Connors, and O'Carrols, defeated the Engliſh.

In 1523, the Earl of Deſmond, meditating a rebellion, applied to the French King for aſſiſtance.

In 1523, O'Nial was in rebellion.

In 1528, we find the Engliſh power ſo reduced, that they paid tribute (called black rents) to the Iriſh chieftains, for protection. O'Connor invaded even the Pale; the Lord Deputy was too weak to revenge the injury, but withheld O'Connor's penſion; O'Connor, in return, took the Deputy priſoner.

In 1529, Kildare, by means of his daughter, Lady Slane, raiſed a great confederacy among the Iriſh chieftains.

In

In the ſame year, a negociation between the Emperor Charles V. and the Earl of Deſmond, only proved ineffectual by the Earl's death.

Freſh inſurrections of the O'Tuathals, O'Connors and O'Carrols ſucceeded, and were cloſed by the great rebellion of Lord Thomas Fitzgerald; which brings us to the period of the reformation.

Here then we preſent a conſiderable difficulty to our opponents, who have attributed all the ſucceeding rebellions ſolely to the antipathy of Catholics to a Proteſtant government; for they are bound to ſhew that the cauſes which produced theſe rebellions, previous to the reformation, ceaſed to operate, before they can reaſonably aſſign the whole effect of ſucceeding rebellions to the influence of religion. Unleſs they can plainly make this appear, they muſt have groſsly exaggerated the ſuppoſed influence of religion in producing theſe unfortunate events; and it is even very poſſible that this influence, which they attribute to religion, did not at the time exiſt.

Now, we maintain this is the very fact; that the influence of the Roman Catholic religion in producing inſurrections, has been without meaſure exaggerated; that it had no ſuch influence until long after the reformation; and that when it did acquire that influence, it was becauſe it was perſecuted, and not becauſe it wiſhed to perſecute.

To

To place this in a clearer light, we will examine the relation which the Catholic religion had with events in Ireland from the period immediately before the reformation, to the great rebellion in the reign of Charles I.; we will endeavour to ſhew how little connection it had with rebellions, until its animoſity was awakened by the intemperate and injurious conduct of the Proteſtants, and to draw from numerous and ſtriking facts, a freſh proof (if freſh proofs are wanting) that humanity, juſtice, toleration and gentleneſs, are the wiſeſt means which a Government can uſe in correcting the religious errors of its ſubjects.

PRIOR to the Reformation in Ireland, the Roman Catholic religion, ſtimulated neither by ſcepticiſm, contradiction nor perſecution, had long ceaſed to have any influence on political events. It was regarded by the maſs of the people with a ſtupid acquieſcence approaching to indifference. The clergy, like all long eſtabliſhed clergy, neglected their duties, and ſo far from inſpiring the enthuſiaſtic attachment which they now do, were conſidered as an oppreſſive incumbrance. We have the authority of Archbiſhop Brown for ſtating, that their ignorance was extreme; and that they were frequently incapable of performing the common offices of religion.

If

If we except the excommunication of the adherents of Warbeck and Simnel by the Pope, we meet with no inſtance of the political influence of the Roman Catholic religion immediately before the Reformation.

Indeed, ſo complete ſeems to have been its inſignificance, that Sir James Ware, though the moſt indefatigable of antiquaries, and poſſeſſed of every facility of reſearch, could not aſcertain accurately the names of biſhops before this period.

For inſtance, " One Thomas was conſecrated Biſhop of Down and Connor. (Ann. 1456.)

" One Thady was advanced to theſe Sees. (1469.)

" One Richard Wolſely ſeems to have been Biſhop. (Ann. 1502.)

" One Tiberias ſucceeded next. (1526.)

" One Thaddeus, a Franciſcan Friar, is ſaid to have been provided to the Biſhoprick of Dromore. (1511.)

" Lawrence O'Galchor, Biſhop of Raphoe, was proceeded againſt for incontinence and other enormous crimes.

" One Donald ſat in the See of Derry in 1423. I am of opinion he reſigned his See, being made uneaſy in it; for Archbiſhop Swain called him to

taſk

taſk for incontinence and other crimes, which being proved on him, he was obliged to do penance.

" Donald was ſucceeded by John, againſt whom a citation iſſued for homicide and other crimes."

Theſe ſpecimens are ſufficient to ſhew that the Roman Catholic religion, like all religions left alone, was far more inclined to ſink into lethargy than riſe to political importance.

If the contrary were the caſe—if we ſuppoſe that the Catholic religion was even at this period poſſeſſed of that inimical ſpirit of bigotry which has been repreſented as incompatible with ſubmiſſion to any authority that it cannot influence, what muſt have taken place upon the event of the reformation? A great and new cauſe of diſaffection being added to former cauſes of notorious activity, more frequent and more inveterate rebellions would have ariſen.

But was this the caſe? No—quite the reverſe: For it was immediately after the reformation that the Iriſh chieftains ſubmitted to the Engliſh government; that the Engliſh power was acknowledged as legal, and that a degree of peace and good order took place, which had been unknown ſince the firſt invaſion of the Engliſh. What then muſt we conclude from this fact?—that there was no ſuch feeling as Catholic bigotry at this period.

The

The truth is, the Iriſh rebellions and Iriſh ſubmiſſions, had not at this period, nor until long after, any connection with religious opinions. Later hiſtorians have aſcribed their own feelings to theſe times; and becauſe religion made a prominent feature in the rebellions of their days, they imagined it muſt have been a cauſe of rebellion from the firſt date of religious ſchiſm. But co-temporary writers never mentioned religion as a cauſe of rebellion, till a long period after the reformation: we plainly perceive to what cauſe they attributed the diſaffection of the natives; their fears are always expreſſed againſt the Iriſhry, not againſt the Papiſts; they found the greateſt oppoſition in national pride, not in religion.

We ſhall be more candid than our opponents; according to their mode of reaſoning, we might allege the ſubmiſſion of the Iriſh chieftains in the reign of Henry VIII. as a proof of Catholic loyalty; but neither their rebellions nor their ſubmiſſions had any connection with religion. The cauſe of theſe ſubmiſſions is curious. It was ſimply the aſſumption of the title of King, in place of Lord of Ireland, by Henry VIII.

The title of Lord of Ireland was not calculated to inſpire the regal deſcendants of Mileſius with much reſpect; it was inferior to their own. Fortunately for the Engliſh power, the diviſions of the Iriſh ſepts had ſuſpended the election of a native

King

King of Ireland, to whom, before the coming of the Engliſh, the Iriſh princes had been accuſtomed to pay allegiance. The title had long been in abeyance, but as ſoon as Henry revived it in his own perſon, the Iriſh chieftains were led by their very prejudices, and by a natural aſſociation of ideas, to pay him homage.

The Iriſh princes reſiſted the feudal ſupremacy of Henry, while neither his rank nor his force was much greater than their own; but when he aſſumed the title to which their feudal allegiance had always been paid, and when he aſked for nothing more than feudal allegiance, they readily ſubmitted.

Is it not then exaggeration, and extreme perverſeneſs, to repreſent popiſh feelings as having any conſiderable influence at this time, when if they had, more general and more exaſperated rebellions would have annihilated the inſignificant force of the Engliſh? Where is that bond of union—where that identity of purpoſe—where that indefatigable zeal, and unmitigated hate, which we are told ever marks the conduct of Papiſts towards Proteſtants?

On the contrary, objects which were never achieved before by invaſion, rapine and deſtruction, were now accompliſhed almoſt without an effort.—

O'Connor, O'Donnel, O'Doyne, M'Mahon,
O'Moor,

O'Moor, M'William, O'Rorke, M'Arty More, M'Arty Reagh, M'Cormick, O'Sullivan, M'Donnough, O'Callaghan, O'Byrne, O'Brien, all independent princes, and governing their ſeveral petty nations, acknowledged Henry as their liege Lord, and did not heſitate to renounce the Pope's uſurpations, and to own the King's ſupremacy.

Sir Richard Cox tells us, that there was not a ſingle chieftain who did not acknowledge Henry's ſupremacy in Church, as well as State; and quotes from Sir John Davis with great naiveté, for a violent bigot, that the Iriſh made no difficulty in renouncing the Pope, when they had once reſolved to obey the King. This involuntary teſtimony of an opponent is ſufficient to prove that religious feelings were at this time of very ſecondary influence.

If the Catholic religion poſſeſſed any immunity from the ſedative influence which proſperity has on all eſtabliſhments—if after long habits of indifference, it could, on the firſt alarm, rouſe the minds of its votaries to that zeal, which in general only ariſes from the *long* endurance of perſecution—if it was the *nature* of popiſh feelings to produce rebellions, this would have been the time when they would have ſhewn their moſt marked influence; when the government openly oppoſed the claims of the Sovereign pontiff, and uſurped his titles—when it diſpoſſeſſed popiſh prelates, ſeized on church lands,

and

and demoliſhed reliques; what plots and rebellions muſt not neceſſarily have followed!

Inſtead of this, we find the Iriſh making every ſubmiſſion that the Engliſh government felt it reaſonable to require; when once the civil claims between the contending parties were ſatisfactorily arranged, we find no ſtreſs laid on the religious claims; we find the Iriſh princes, even the great O'Neil, accepting titles from the *King* of Ireland, which they had always deſpiſed when offered by the *Lord* of Ireland. Peace was for the firſt time univerſal: the French King offered his aſſiſtance to the Iriſh princes in vain, and in vain endeavoured to excite them to revolt. The Engliſh government for once appeared in a creditable alliance with its Iriſh vaſſals—the army reduced at home, and an Iriſh army aſſiſting the Engliſh King at Calais. Leland characteriſes the loyalty of the times as even outrageous.

When, therefore, the adverſaries of the Catholics tell us that it is the *nature* of that religion to produce rebellions under a Proteſtant government; and yet we find that at the time when the whole nation were Catholics—when they were particularly uncivilized, and proportionally bigoted; that an open and unprecedented attack—an unceremonious reverſal of every thing held ſacred, was followed by no immediate commotion; and that a very ſhort period after, an unheard-of degree of peace and

loyalty

loyalty ſucceeded, muſt we not conclude that they have *exaggerated* the effects of Catholic principles, or rather that no diſloyalty flows neceſſarily from ſuch principles, but that the diſloyalty which has ſince been conſidered as a characteriſtic of the Catholics, has ariſen from the very unwarrantable and very unwiſe ſeverity with which the Catholics have been treated?

So far it is clear that in Henry the Eighth's reign, religion had no important influence in producing rebellions: yet it was not to be expected that, however lax the ancient religion might have become, it could be ſuddenly aſſailed in its fundamental tenets, without producing a revulſion in the minds of a very ignorant people. Even if a general commotion had taken place, we ſhould by no means be juſtified in arguing that rebellion againſt the civil power was a neceſſary effect of Catholic dogmas. In ſimilar circumſtances any ſect might have flown to arms, as the Proteſtants under the reign of James II. did, but it is ſingular, how little reſiſtance was made to the reformation in Ireland. This reſiſtance was virtually confined to a ſingle individual, Archbiſhop Cromer.

The great majority of the prelates and of the parliament, either favoured or made no oppoſition to the reformation. The general ignorance of the nation was the greateſt obſtacle to its progreſs; yet that it gained ground is evident, from the alarm felt by the See of Rome, who thought it neceſſary

to

to ſend over a private commiſſion to Cromer, and to excite the northern dynaſt, O'Neil, to commence hoſtilities.

To ſuppoſe that *no* oppoſition would be given to a great revolution in the national religion, would be extravagant; the clergy of courſe were intereſted to oppoſe it. Principle, as well as habit, would influence many of the laity to oppoſe it: but all things conſidered the oppoſition was inconſiderable; it might have been entirely obviated by judicious management; certainly it was not conducted with that intemperance, which argues a peculiar tendency in the Catholic religion to produce a rebellion againſt a Proteſtant government.

In fact, the reformation during the reign of Henry the Eighth was conducted with very little violence towards the Catholic *laity;* there conſequently was very little reaction from reſentment or bigotry, and though late hiſtorians deſcribe the Prieſts as flying from city to city to animate their flocks to rebellion, yet as we find no *facts* to ſupport the aſſertion, we muſt conclude they deſcribed what they thought probable, not what really was the caſe.

We are now bound to ſhew what *was* the cauſe of the rebellion which followed the ſubmiſſion of the Iriſh princes. This cauſe we imagine was a clear infraction on the part of Henry, of the terms on which the ſubmiſſions of the Iriſh were grounded;

and

and a well founded apprehenſion that their power and independence were in danger of freſh encroachments.

The Iriſh chieftains had acknowledged Henry the Eighth as their liege lord; but in the very indentures of ſubmiſſion, their own prerogatives were acknowledged and remained untouched. Thus O'Sullivan, ſuæ nationis primus; Mac Donough, de Allow, ſuæ nationis caput. Donaldus O'Calaghan, nationis ſuæ primus.

In theſe indentures are only reſerved the uſual ſervices or tribute payable to the liege lord; the Chieftains were neither required to pay taxes, to ſubmit to the Engliſh, or perform any one duty of ſubjects. They retained undiſputed, the privilege of making war or peace among their ſeveral nations, of raiſing troops, of levying taxes, and the elective ſucceſſion to their petty thrones.

Under theſe ſtipulations, they freely promiſe to annihilate the Pope's authority, and every thing that ſupports it.*

So far was the Engliſh government, at that time, from aſſuming any right of actual ſovereignty over the Iriſh princes, that the legality of the appointment of Taniſts (or elective ſucceſſors) was tacitly acknowledged

* The words are—" Uſurpatoris primaciem et authoritatem Romani Epiſcopi anihilabunt, omneſque ſuos fautores, adjutores precipitabunt et abolebunt."

ledged by the Parliament of 1543, which enacts that the fines of petty larceny, ſhall be paid to the taniſt of the country.

It had, however, long been the policy of the Iriſh government to take every opportunity of diminiſhing the power of the Iriſh chieftains, and Henry was of too arbitrary a temper to brook the independence of theſe petty ſovereigns. As yet, however, the Engliſh force had not been ſufficiently ſtrong to aim openly at their ſubjection; and therefore thoſe artifices, which power ſtoops to uſe when it cannot compel, were adopted.

Henry, or his agents in Ireland, ſaw the advantage that would accrue from getting the Iriſh Princes to appeal to his deciſions; and had an excellent excuſe in their numerous and violent diſſenſions, which ſeemed to point out the neceſſity of an arbitrator. The Iriſh chieftains were aware of the ſnare, and ſaid, "It is true we want arbitrators, but if you pleaſe, we will name them ourſelves:" accordingly, we find regular arbitrators appointed, moſtly biſhops, but particular ſtreſs laid that the Earl of Deſmond ſhould be one; who, being in the equivocal ſtation of a revolted Engliſh ſubject, poſſeſſed of all the princely prerogatives of an Iriſh chieftain, would be particularly on his guard againſt the encroachments of the Engliſh power, and the invaſion of theſe Iriſh prerogatives, on which his own conſequence had been entirely founded.

On theſe terms the Iriſh chieftains ſubmitted without any ſcruple reſpecting religion. "But they ſoon reſumed their arms"—it is true, though not on account of religion, but becauſe all theſe terms were violated or trampled on by the Engliſh government. If we can ſhew this to have been the caſe, is it not ſufficient? why multiply cauſes unneceſſarily? why be at the pains to conjure up the Pope, where he would not naturally make his appearance?

On the contrary, Theobald de Boys was ſent to Ireland as ambaſſador, to make a league with the Iriſh chieftains, and met with no ſucceſs: a ſmall Iriſh army attended the King at Calais; every thing remained tranquil; until when? until Sir Anthony St. Leger, (as a Proteſtant hiſtorian expreſſes it) finding the kingdom quiet, determined to *keep it ſo.*

Of thoſe whom he ſuſpected, he impriſoned ſome, and obliged others to give hoſtages; but theſe meaſures were calculated to produce only partial diſaffection: he proceeded to another meaſure which was certain to excite every Iriſh chieftain in oppoſition to the Engliſh Government.

Let us hear the account of this tranſaction from the mouth of Sir Richard Cox, the apologiſt for every bad action performed by a Lord Deputy.

"Sir

"Sir Anthony St. Leger made it his buſineſs to break the dependencies of the Iriſh, and to that end upon all references to him, he took care that the weaker party might depend on the government for protection; and that he ſhould not rely upon, or be under the ſubjection of any other; and particularly on the 14th of July, he made an award between O'Neil and O'Donnel, whereby O'Donnel was freed from depending on O'Neil.

We ſhall not enquire whether this was good policy or not; its immediate effect muſt have been, to alarm and irritate the principal Iriſh chieftains. Theſe, it is true, acknowledged Henry as liege Lord: but, by the ſame rule, they were liege Lords themſelves in their own kingdoms, and had each their dependent princes, over whom their power was much greater than that of the King of England over them. They drew their revenues principally from the chieftains dependant on them, and therefore they could not ſee, without great jealouſy, a ſyſtem adopted by the Engliſh government which aimed directly at the diminution of their power, and the impoveriſhment of their treaſures.

This ſyſtem was perfidious as well as unjuſt, becauſe it had been expreſsly provided in the indentures of ſubmiſſion, that, not the Engliſh government, but that certain biſhops and the Earl of Deſmond were to be the arbitrators of differences ariſing between the Iriſh chieftains. True, it is ſaid,

that the Lord Deputy made the award on a reference to him; but it is plain, that the reference was made only by the one party; by the weaker who knew he ſhould be ſupported, not by the ſtronger who knew he ſhould be cruſhed.

We repeat again, that we are not conſidering the policy of the meaſure; it is ſufficient for our argument that it would appear moſt unjuſt and vexatious to the moſt powerful of the Iriſh chieftains; and, therefore, that the rebellion which followed was attributable to this circumſtance, and not to religion; for, we read immediately after, that, "now the ſpirit of rebellion had again ſeized the Iriſh, and O'Neal, (the victim of the Lord Deputy's policy) O'Donnel, O'Doherty, and O'Callock, made overtures to the French King.

This appears to be a clear and ſatisfactory reaſon for the diſturbances in Ireland at the end of Henry the Eighth's reign; we are at leaſt informed of no other; nor ſhould we heſitate to adopt it, becauſe it has been overlooked and diſregarded by hiſtorians of later times; for their heads were ſo occupied with religious animoſity, that they referred every effect to that cauſe, whether it hand any relation to it or not.

EDWARD

EDWARD VI.

THERE is ſcarcely a pretext for ſuppoſing that the diſturbances in Ireland during the reign of Edward VI. proceeded from the influence of the Roman Catholic religion. The Engliſh Lord Deputies made uſe of no precipitate meaſures of violence againſt the Roman Catholics; and, in conſequence, the Reformation proceeded without exciting any marked public diſcontent. Later Proteſtant writers could not conceive this to have been the caſe, and have given florid deſcriptions of the prejudice and terror, with which the nation ſurveyed the progreſs of hereſy and innovation. But when we aſk for facts, we find only one ſolitary inſtance on which all this fiction is founded, namely, the oppoſition of Archbiſhop Dowdal to the tranſlation of the liturgy. Is there any wonder that an Archbiſhop ſhould be found to ſtickle for doctrinal myſtery? Is it not rather ſurpriſing that only *one* was found? We read of no chieftain rebelling on account of religion, nor even making it a pretext for rebellion—we ſee no apprehenſion of any thing of the kind entertained by the government; and we muſt be convinced that hiſtorians are guilty of an anachroniſm when they attribute the fear of popery (a prodigy of much later growth) to theſe times. A deciſive proof that

the

the government had no reaſon to dread popery, and that the temper of the times was indifferent to either ſide of the queſtion, is, that the ſame year produced biſhops of both ſorts; on the 10th of May, 1550, Arthur Magennis, by proviſion of the Pope, conſtituted Biſhop of Dromore, and the appointment was confirmed by the King; and on the 3d day of September, Thomas Lancaſter, a Proteſtant, was made Biſhop of Kildare. In the remote provinces of Ireland all the Biſhops were Catholics; nor was the oppoſition of Dowdal puniſhed by removal from his See, until he voluntarily abandoned the kingdom. So little idea was there of rebellion on account of religion, that Cuſack, in his letter to the Duke of Northumberland, mentions this as a period of the greateſt tranquillity, highly favourable to the legal reformation of the kingdom.

Yet, though government gave no general cauſe of diſcontent to the Catholics, there were many particular ſeverities and inſults which laid the grounds of religious animoſity. Archbiſhop Brown made war againſt images and reliques, with more zeal than prudence. The garriſon of Athlone, no very conciliating reformers, were allowed to pillage the celebrated church of Clonmaccanaiſe, and to violate the ſhrine of a great favourite of the people, St. Kieran. The valuable furniture of the churches was every where ſeized and expoſed to ſale, ſo that the Catholics might very well ſuſpect that the low eſtimation

eſtimation which the Proteſtants entertained for the ſacred uſes of church decorations, aroſe from a keener ſenſe of their pecuniary value.

However, the time was not yet arrived when religious bigotry had added its terrible influence to the other evils which waſted Ireland. The cauſes of the diſturbances in the reign of Edward VI. were the ſame as thoſe in Henry VIII. with the important addition of extenſive confiſcations.

The ſame policy was adopted, the ſame attempts to acquire a right to interfere in, and to regulate the concerns of the Iriſh chieftains.

We have ſeen that in the reign of Henry VIII. the territories and revenues of the powerful houſe of O'Neil, were curtailed, by *ordering* O'Donnel to be independent of him. This naturally produced diſcontent, but as the head of the ſept was a man of feeble character, no war enſued: Of courſe another encroachment was made; and in the reign of Edward VI. Macguire, Roe O'Neil, and ſeveral other chieftains, were declared independant of O'Neil, and the tribute (Bonnaught) paid to him, was ſeized on by the Engliſh government!

O'Donnel, too, who had been declared independent of O'Neil, found, like the horſe who craved aſſiſtance from the man, that a too powerful ally is not eaſily ſhaken off; for his dependants were alſo declared

declared independent. The interference of the Engliſh government ſeemed now to be generally dreaded, as in this inſtance the dependants were *forced* into their independence, *both* parties being obliged to obey the order on pain of forfeiting their eſtates.

This ſyſtem of breaking the dependencies, as it was called, of the Iriſh chieftains, was a very obvious means of leſſening their power, and converting the nominal ſovereignty, which the Engliſh held over them, into an actual one. Other means were alſo adopted.

Upon the death of a chieftain, the Engliſh took every opportunity of impoſing their own rule of hereditary deſcent, in place of the Iriſh mode of election. By thus obtaining the power for a dependant of their own, they could either exerciſe an abſolute dominion over him, or make him an inſtrument to oppoſe a more powerful rival.

Thus, on the death of Murrogh O'Brien, Earl of Thomond, the Baron of Ibracken, the next in ſucceſſion by blood, was obliged by the ſept to nominate a Taniſt. Daniel O'Brien was appointed to this dignity, but was obliged to relinquiſh it by the interference of the Engliſh; and Leland relates that this was the cauſe (not becauſe he was a Catholic) of the ſanguinary and ſucceſsful war which he afterwards waged againſt the Engliſh.

An attempt was made by the Engliſh government to undermine the power of another dynaſty by the ſame means.

The great Con O'Neil had been perſuaded by Henry VIII. to accept an Engliſh title, the Earldom of Tirowen, which the Engliſh choſe to conſider as a ſpecies of enliſting, that ever after made the chieftain ſubject to military diſcipline. The title and the principality were entailed on an illegitimate ſon. This, of courſe, was a very obnoxious proceeding to the legitimate ſons, and to the whole ſept, and the power of the baſtard, Matthew, reſted entirely on the ſupport of the Engliſh. He, feeling this, in order to pay his court, turned informer againſt his father, who was ſeized and impriſoned. Shane O'Neil, the legitimate ſon, invaded the baſtard's territory. The latter, ſupported by the Lord Deputy, took the field; the armies met, and Shane O'Neil obtained a complete victory. Yet the deep enmity which Shane ever after retained againſt the Engliſh, has ſeriouſly been brought as a proof of the bigotry of the Catholic religion!

It is plain that the reſentment and jealouſy of the Iriſh chieftains on account of theſe encroachments, muſt have been in exact proportion to their power and independence. The only right which the Engliſh could claim ſo to interfere, was either from force or from cuſtom. That they did not poſſeſs a force adequate to the object is clear. The military ſtrength of the Engliſh, at the beginning of the reign of

Edward

Edward VI. does not appear to have exceeded 3000 men, and theſe were almoſt entirely Catholics. The extent of territory which the Engliſh poſſeſſed was contemptible, being confined to the little diſtrict of the Pale, and a few ſea-port towns; for, we read, that Sir Edward Bellingham was the firſt man ſince the time of Edward III. that enlarged the Engliſh territory beyond the Pale; ſo that the Engliſh government, from the time of Edward III. until the reign of Edward VI. had not even the right to the monarchy of Ireland which flows from poſſeſſion, but were like the reſt of the chieftains, merely Lords of a provincial diſtrict.

Neither could the Engliſh claim from cuſtom any right of controlling the different intereſts of the Iriſh chieftains. For even theſe encroachments were made under indirect pretences, while apparently the Iriſh princes, and even the degenerate Engliſh chieftains, were left in a preſcriptive enjoyment of their ſavage independence, and their mutual feuds. What can be a more ſtriking proof than that they retained the right of making war, peace and treaties, without any dread or expectation of the Lord Deputy's interference? not to go farther back than the reign we are ſpeaking of for inſtances, we find that "Manus O'Donnel fought a pitched battle with Calvagh O'Donnel, in Ulſter, on the 7th of February, 1547."

"In Lower Delvin, Mac Maklin and Fally, with their united forces, invaded the country of the M'Coughlans."

"The

"The Earl of Thomond was at open war with his uncle, notwithſtanding the Lord Deputy had uſed his good offices to unite them."

"Richard Burke was at variance with the ſons of Thomas Burke: Richard was taken priſoner, and many of his men ſlain."

"Nor were the conteſts leſs violent between Richard Earl of Clanricarde, and John Burke. The Earl beſieged John's caſtle, but Daniel O'Bryan came to John's relief, and forced the Earl to raiſe the ſiege."

From theſe circumſtances it is plain, that the Iriſh chieftains in the reign of Edward VI. could not be expected, either from motives of prudence or right, to eſteem themſelves *ſubjects* to the Engliſh; and Leland is guilty of a groſs miſapplication of modern ideas to former times, when he talks of the *diſloyalty* of the Iriſh chieftains. They were not at that time ſubjects either *de jure* or *de facto*.

Their ſubmiſſion was merely feudal, and nominal; and conſequently when the Engliſh wilfully perverted this nominal acknowledgment of ſovereignty into an actual enforcement of ſubjection—when they proceeded to interfere with the internal arrangement of each chieftain's petty empire—to releaſe his actual ſubjects from their allegiance—to deſtroy his revenues, and alter or abrogate the laws of his nation, and particularly the laws of ſucceſſion, can we not

ſee

ſee ſufficient reaſons for his oppoſing the Engliſh (or if you will call it ſo, rebelling) without referring to a cauſe which does not appear to have exiſted, namely, the Catholic hatred of Proteſtantiſm?

The Engliſh practiſed towards the Iriſh chieftains exactly that ſpecies of fraud which is frequent in bargains, when one party enforces his own ſenſe of the terms, although he is aware that the other party never underſtood the terms in that ſenſe.

The Iriſh chieftains ſubmitted as feudal princes; the Engliſh knew that they did ſo, but they *choſe* to underſtand that the Iriſh ſubmitted as ſubjects. Like all men, conſcious of duplicity, they acted with inconſiſtency. Though they began to call the Iriſh chieftains rebels, they felt they were not ſo; and whenever theſe chieftains were induced to ſubmit, their ſubmiſſion was always received as a compliment, not as a matter of right, and was rewarded by titles and very conſiderable grants of land. Nothing eſſential was aſked of them in return. Leland acknowledges that all their princely poſſeſſions and rights were guaranteed to them; and ſays, that "ſo little did they apprehend that their preſent engagements would produce any eſſential regulation of their territories, that they ſtill governed their followers by the uſual courſe of Brehon law."

However unwarrantable by any prior right, this interference was, and however calculated to rouſe

the

the reſiſtance of the Iriſh chieftains, ſtill it might at laſt have produced the general reformation of Ireland, by eſtabliſhing the Engliſh conſtitution and laws, in place of the barbarous uſages of the Iriſh, if ſuch had been the real object of the Engliſh.

But the Engliſh of thoſe days, if they regarded the welfare of Ireland at all, regarded it with a malignant eye; their objects were to gratify their avarice as well as pride, to pillage as well as to tyrannize.

When they invaded the independent privileges of the Iriſh princes, and choſe to conſider their reſiſtance as rebellion; had they contented themſelves with aboliſhing the power and exactions of theſe princes, and extended to their wretched vaſſals, the protection, the ſecurity, and perfect freedom of the Engliſh conſtitution and Engliſh law; had they given them that intereſt in their lands which ariſes from the rule of lineal deſcent, inſtead of the barbarous mode eſtabliſhed by the Iriſh Brehon laws; they would have fairly won from theſe chieftains, the devotion of their ſubjects, and might have deſpiſed the reſentment of theſe ancient dynaſtics, when bankrupt in the affection of their followers.

But intent only on pillage, their uſurpation was ſo ruinous, that it gave to the native tyrannies grievous as they were, a preference which animated every heart and hand in their defence, and from this æra,

the

the animoſity of the Iriſh became more general and more virulent.

For the Engliſh not only invaded the privileges of the native princes, but they *confiſcated the lands of their vaſſals.*

Though the Iriſh chieftains exacted much from their wretched followers, ſtill it was under the authority of certain laws, and ſomething was left; the Engliſh ſwept away every thing.

This gave the Iriſh clans a clear intereſt in ſupporting their chieftains, this was the impulſe that began, this gave the energy that ſupported the ſucceeding rebellion. What idle miſrepreſention is it, to ſuppreſs a cauſe ſo intelligible—ſo powerful, and to aſcribe its effect to religion!

It was in the reign of Edward the VI. that the ſolid foundation of the ſucceeding rebellion was firſt laid, by the confiſcation of the lands of Leix and Offalia, now in the Queen and King's counties.

This important event is thus briefly related by hiſtorians.

Upon the acceſſion of Edward VI. O'Moor, prince of Leix, and O'Connor, prince of Offalia, drew the ſword on pretence of ſome injury received. The Lord Deputy defeated them, ravaged their territory,

ſeized

ſeized on the lands, and drove out the old inhabitants. The chieftains themſelves were induced to ſurrender and to attend the Deputy to England, under the tacit promiſe not only of pardon, but the grant of the ſame favors and honors which Henry VIII. had beſtowed on the chieftains who ſurrendered to him. Inſtead of this promiſe being fulfilled, they were thrown into priſon, their lands (*i. e.* the lands of the whole ſept) were declared forfeited and granted to the very officers who had induced them to ſurrender. O'Moor died in priſon, O'Connor attempting to eſcape was ſubjected to a ſtrict and ſevere confinement. The new proprietors eſtabliſhed their ſettlements by fire and ſword, the moſt powerful members of theſe great ſepts were enliſted into the army in England, while the inſurrections of the poorer proprietors were *chaſtiſed* by the forces quartered in the country.

Two whole counties diſpoſed of in this cavalier manner, two principalities extinguiſhed at a blow, and two tribes reduced to beggary, were ſufficient cauſes to produce a general alarm among every ſept, as well as in all the chieftains in Ireland.

Theſe circumſtances appear ſufficient to prove that a very ſmall part of the origin of theſe wars is to be aſcribed to religion, which, if we except the petty inſurrection of the family of Fitz-Euſtace (and this is not a very clear caſe) ſeems to have had very little influence on events during this reign. But we muſt be allowed to dwell a little longer on the ſubject; for

for where new principles are advanced, to account for hiſtorical events of diſtant date, they cannot be ſupported by too many illuſtrations.

Let it then be conſidered, that this invaſion of the rights of the Iriſh chieftains, and the reſiſtance which it is here alleged to have produced, were not events peculiar to Ireland, but had in fact flowed from a general criſis of political improvement, which had taken place ſucceſſively through every ſtate in Europe. In feudal times every nobleman enjoyed the prerogatives, and in ſeveral countries the title of king. Their dependance on their ſovereign was for a long time merely feudal and nominal, while their power over their vaſſals was arbitrary and excluſive. As the power of the crown increaſed, a ſtruggle neceſſarily took place, which was the cauſe of wars throughout the whole of Europe. This was ſtrictly the caſe between the Engliſh government and the old chieftains of Engliſh race, who had become independent in Ireland. It was nearly the ſame with reſpect to the Iriſh chieftains, only with leſs appearance of right upon the part of the Engliſh, as theſe chieftains could at no time have ever been conſidered in the light of ſubjects, their ſurrender to Henry II. being of the ſame nature as their ſurrender to Henry VIII. merely feudal, reſerving to themſelves all their princely prerogatives; like the bequeſt of Lewis XI. to the Virgin Mary, of the whole and entire of his county of Boulogne, ſaving and excepting the *revenues*.

What

What was the caſe at the ſame æra in France? No one can attentively read the hiſtory of the celebrated League, without perceiving how much more influence the ambition of the nobility had on events than religion. For even long after Henry IV. changed his religion, when this pretext was removed, the Duke of Montpenſier propoſed to him, in the name of the principal French nobility, that he ſhould reſign to the governors of the provinces, the property of their governments, with an *hereditary* right to them, requiring nothing from them but a feudal allegiance.* This ſhews the temper of the times, which ran entirely in favour of ariſtocratic independence; the encreaſing power of the Crown appeared a novelty and encroachment, and was every where reſiſted with as much enthuſiaſm as the invaſion of a foreign enemy. It only appears more conſpicuous in Ireland, becauſe the extreme weakneſs of the Engliſh colony had allowed not only the Iriſh chieftains, but its own ſubjects, to acquire an independence that had now gained the ſanction of preſcription.

* See alſo the treaty between Lewis XI. and the great feudal Lords, in the Memoirs of Philip de Comines.

MARY.

THERE is a very remarkable and concluſive proof that popiſh bigotry had no great influence on the tranſactions of theſe times in Ireland, which is this; that when Mary, a popiſh princeſs, was called to the throne, and the Catholic religion reſtored, rebellions continued juſt as frequent as ever.

Sir Richard Cox allows the fact, but is ſo blinded by the idea, that every rebellion muſt have ariſen from religion, that he profeſſes himſelf at a loſs to account for it.

The following chieftains were engaged in reiterated inſurrections: O'Connor, O'Neil, O'Carrol, Cavenagh, O'Madden, O'Molloy, O'Doyne, Mac Coughlan, Mac Geoghan, Fylemy Duff, O'Reilly, the Earl of Deſmond, and Daniel O'Brien.

Theſe very chieftains who had acknowledged Henry's ſupremacy in Church and State, revolted and agitated the whole country under the reign of the moſt zealous friend of the Catholic religion.

Surely,

Surely, attachment to the Catholic religion was not the ruling motive to which we muſt refer the events of theſe times.

A ſtill more ſtriking proof that the Iriſh Roman Catholics in Queen Mary's reign, were very little infected with religious bigotry, may be drawn from their conduct towards the Proteſtants, when the Proteſtants were at their mercy.

Were we to argue from the repreſentations of the indelible character of the Catholic religion, as pourtrayed by its adverſaries, we ſhould have expected that the Iriſh Catholics would have exerciſed every kind of perſecution which the double motives of zeal and retaliation could ſuggeſt. The Catholic laity, in all the impunity of triumphant bigotry, hunting the wretched Heretics from their hiding places—the Catholic clergy pouring out the libation of human blood at the ſhrine of the God of Mercy, and acting before high Heaven thoſe ſcenes which make the angels weep.

But on the contrary. Though the religious feelings of the Iriſh Catholics, and their feelings as men, had been treated with very little ceremony during the two preceding reigns; they made a wiſe and moderate uſe of their aſcendancy. They entertained no reſentment for the paſt; they laid no plans for future domination.

Even Leland allows that the only inſtance of popiſh zeal, was annulling grants which Archbiſhop Brown had made, to the injury of the See of Dublin, and certainly this ſtep was full as agreeable to the rules of law and equity, as to popiſh zeal.

The aſſertors of the Reformation during the preceding reigns, were every way unmoleſted, or as the Proteſtant hiſtorian chooſes to term it, were allowed to ſink into obſcurity and neglect.

Such was the general ſpirit of toleration, that many Engliſh families, friends to the Reformation, took refuge in Ireland, and there enjoyed their opinions and worſhip without moleſtation.

The Iriſh Proteſtants, vexed that they could not prove a ſingle inſtance of bigotry againſt the Catholics, in this their hour of trial, invented a tale, as palpably falſe as it is childiſh, of an intended perſecution, (but a perſecution by the Engliſh government, not by the Iriſh Catholics) and ſo much does bigotry pervert all candour and taſte, that even the Earl of Cork, Archbiſhop Uſher, and in later times, Dr. Leland, were not aſhamed to ſupport the ſilly ſtory of Dean Cole and the Knave of Clubs.

How ought theſe perverſe and ſuperficial men to bluſh, who have ſaid that the Iriſh Roman Catholics muſt be bigots and rebels, from the very nature of their religion, and who have advanced this falſehood,

in

in the very teeth of fact, and contrary to the moſt diſtinct evidence of hiſtory.

The Iriſh Roman Catholics bigots! The Iriſh Roman Catholics are the only ſect that ever reſumed power, without exerciſing vengeance.

Shew a brighter inſtance, if you can, in the whole page of hiſtory. Was this the conduct of Knox or Calvin, or of the brutal Council of Edward VI. who ſhed tears as he ſigned its bloody warrants? Has this been the conduct of the Iriſh Proteſtants?

Had the Iriſh Roman Catholics, when they gained the aſcendancy, debarred you of the rights of property, of the benefits of education, of the enjoyment of ſocial worſhip, of the ſecurity of your domeſtic peace, of all that makes life grateful, by making it reſpectable? O! how would you not have bewailed your unmerited ſufferings—how would you not have adjured the deteſtation of God and man on ſuch monſtrous oppreſſion!

How ſtrangely does bigotry cramp the heart and underſtanding! who could have thought that ſo obvious and ſplendid a proof of the original virtues of the Iriſh Roman Catholics, as this, ſhould have been ſlurred over, and almoſt effaced by the wilful blindneſs of Proteſtant writers!

So natural is it that lions ſhould be always repreſented as vanquiſhed, when men are the painters.

The

The Catholie religion, certainly could have no effect in producing rebellions during Mary's reign, yet we have ſhewn that rebellion ſtill exiſted.

The cauſes of it were ſtill the ſame.

" The old Iriſh inhabitants of Leix and Offalia, or the King and Queen's Counties, could not patiently reſign their claims and poſſeſſions to the new ſettlers. They were ever ſpiriting up their friends and followers to reſiſt, what they deemed an injurious uſurpation of their lands, and thus brought down the vengeance of government upon their heads. Numbers of them were cut off in the field, or executed by martial law, and the whole race of them would have been thus utterly extirpated, had not the Earls of Kildare and Ormond interceded with the Queen, and become ſureties for the peaceable behaviour of ſome ſurvivors!!—of *some* ſurvivors!"

What a narrative delivered by the reſpectable Leland without comment or deduction!

Yet, as if the actual commiſſion of unqualified confiſcation, was not ſufficient to ſpread alarm, and excite reſiſtance; the Engliſh government made an unequivocal demonſtration of their intention of poſſeſſing themſelves of the whole kingdom.

The Chancellor was empowered to direct a commiſſion for viewing all the towns, villages, and waſte grounds

grounds of the kingdom, and reducing them to counties, shires, and hundreds.*

This was a direct blow at the independence of the Iriſh chieftains, and the government were very well aware of the effect this meaſure was likely to produce, for it provided that this commiſſion might be ſuſpended at any time in ſeven years, in caſe it created too much oppoſition.

Yet ſuch is the inconſiſtency, ſuch the wavering irreſolution of conſcious injuſtice; that at the very time the Engliſh government prepared, under the maſk of law, to poſſeſs themſelves of the lands of the native ſepts; they acquieſced in the conſtitution, and the lawful title of the Iriſh dynaſties.

"Owen Macgennis, on the 6th of December, 1553, was admitted by the lord deputy to be chief of his ſept."

Kevanagh, head of the great Leinſter family of M'Marchad, was created a peer of the realm by the title of Baron Balyan, but by the ſame patent was nominated chief of his ſept or nation; exerciſing the ancient juriſdiction over all his followers.

So little did the Iriſh chieftains acknowledge any actual right of ſovereignty in the Engliſh government, that

* The territory of every Iriſh ſept came under the denomination of waſte lands; for, as it was held in common by the whole ſept, there were ſcarcely any diviſions or encloſures.

that they ſtill carried on their mutual wars, governed their ſeveral nations, elected their taniſts or ſucceſſors, without any deference to the lord deputy.

Yet his interference was ſufficient to ſupport the alarm which ſeems at this time to have ſpread pretty generally through the Iriſh chieftains. The firſt object of the Engliſh government was to entail the Iriſh principalities on the eldeſt ſon; which was conſidered as a ſubmiſſion to the Engliſh yoke. The ſon in this caſe owed his appointment to the Engliſh, and would naturally be ſubſervient to them; whereas when the chieftain was elected by his nation, the Engliſh government having no influence in his appointment, could have no pretence to conſider him as a dependant.

Happily there is one inſtance of the nature and effects of this ſpecies of interference, which may be pretty clearly made out, from ſuch incidental mention as is made of it by hiſtorians; and will ſerve as a ſpecimen of all the reſt. This is the extinction of the principality of Thomond.

Murrogh O'Brien, king of Thomond, ſwore fealty to Henry VIII. and accepted of the title of Earl of Thomond, which earldom was entailed on his ſon Connor. Murrogh O'Brien retained all his prerogatives, and the title only was entailed; the Engliſh government purpoſely confounded the earldom with the principality, and becauſe the one was entailed,

entailed, choſe to conſider the other was entailed alſo. It is not improbable that Murrogh himſelf, little ſuſpecting the farther encroachments the Engliſh would make, if ſuffered to achieve this firſt ſtep, was flattered with the idea of his principality being changed from an elective to an hereditary title.

His ſubjects, however, muſt have regarded the change with indignation; their prejudices muſt have been violently ſhocked at the idea of the old cuſtom of election being violated, and their pride muſt have been ſenſibly wounded at the entire loſs of influence which they would ſuffer when the throne was no longer filled by the man of their choice.

Upon the death of Murrogh, his ſon Connor, who probably had been choſen taniſt during his father's life-time, ſucceeded.

The ſept then proceeded to chuſe a taniſt or ſucceſſor to him, and their choice fell upon his brother Daniel, in preference to his ſon.* This was agreeable to an old Iriſh cuſtom, which always preferred the brother to the nephew.

Upon this the Engliſh government, in Mary's reign, interfered, and inſiſted upon the ſon being choſen taniſt. A war enſued, in which Connor loſt his life, and

* The Iriſh, in order to avoid the diſturbances ariſing from the election of a chief on the death of his predeceſſor, elected a ſucceſſor during the life of the reigning chief. This ſucceſſor was

and the Engliſh ſucceeded in eſtabliſhing his ſon by force of arms, to the excluſion of Daniel, who was the lawful ſucceſſor.

In this inſtance we ſee the advantage which they reaped by ſetting up a rival to the legal chief. For the ſon feeling himſelf entirely dependant on the Engliſh government, conſented to hold his lands as an Engliſh ſubject, and to renounce the title of the O'Brien. This was regarded by the ſept, not as the conduct of a rebellious ſubject reclaimed to loyalty, but as a dereliction of every honourable, ſacred, and legal principle. This is the deſcription the Iriſh analyſts of the time give of it: " He accepted," they ſay, the title of earl, but gave up the dignity of Dalkais, to the aſtoniſhment and indignation of the deſcendants of Heber, Heremon, and Ith.

Here, the deſigns of the Engliſh government, in their anxiety to make the Iriſh ſovereignties hereditary, were plainly betrayed. Their interference became generally ſuſpected, and was always ſtrenuouſly oppoſed.

We ſcarcely need inſiſt, that the war which Daniel O'Brien waged during the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth,

was called a taniſt. Inſtead of taking the title of prince, the chieftain omitted his Chriſtian name, and was called " the O'Neil," " the O'Donnel," &c. a circumſtance which has leſſened the intereſt their misfortunes would have excited; as they appear to rank no higher in hiſtory than private gentlemen or leaders of clans.

beth, was to maintain his right, and not from attachment to his religion.

The inſurrection of Shane O'Neil aroſe from ſimilar motives.

We have ſeen that the Engliſh government, in a moment of power, had cauſed Matthew, the baſtard of Con. O'Neil, to be appointed his ſucceſſor, and entailed the principality on the heirs male of Matthew.

But upon the death of Con. O'Neil, his legitimate ſon, Shane O'Neil, was formally inveſted with the ſovereignty, by the ſept; and ſupported his juſt rights by arms, againſt his baſtard brother and the Engliſh government.

It is plain that the conduct of Con. O'Neil, in allowing the ſucceſſion to the principality to be regulated by the Engliſh, was extremely odious to the whole ſept; as his ſon Shane appeared juſtified in throwing him into priſon, and increaſed his own popularity by doing ſo.

A few years after the lord deputy, Sir Henry Sydney, paid the moſt abject court to Shane, by going to him, and ſtanding God-father to his child, (which was conſidered by the Iriſh as a ſtronger tie than affinity,) at the very time that Shane was in open arms.

At

At this ceremony a converſation took place between the lord deputy and Shane; which proves clearly that we have ſtated correctly the feelings and opinions of the Iriſh chieftains.

Sir Henry Sydney expoſtulated with Shane, on account of his inſurrection, and his oppoſition to Matthew's title. Attend to Shane's anſwer, which is pregnant with information:

He replied, "that in the firſt place, Matthew was a baſtard; that any how, he could not derive a title from their father Con O'Neil's ſurrender to Henry VIII. for that Con's ſurrender was void, becauſe he had but an eſtate for life in his principality; nor could have more by the law of taniſtry, nor could ſurrender but by conſent of the lords of his country; and that even by the Engliſh laws, the letters patent were void, becauſe there was no inquiſition taken before they were paſt, nor could there be any inquiſition till the country of Tyrone was made ſhire ground. That he was elected O'Neil by the nation, according to cuſtom; that he was the legitimate ſon and heir of his father, and laſtly, that his title to all he claims is by *preſcription*."

To a ſtatement ſo reaſonable, Sir Henry Sydney had nothing to reply, and during his government Shane O'Neil was unmoleſted.

So far religion had little influence on events in Ireland, and the reign of Mary cloſed, unſtained by

by the crimes of any holy perſecutor in Ireland. We muſt alſo do the Iriſh Proteſtants the juſtice to ſay, that they were free from all ſpirit of intolerance. That came from England.

The Iriſh Proteſtants had undergone no perſecution, they conſequently neither increaſed in zeal or numbers. In England, the Proteſtants had ſuffered much perſecution; their numbers in conſequence had multiplied, and their zeal become exceſſive.

One would imagine that the horrors of Mary's reign in England, would have impreſſed on the moſt callous heart, and the dulleſt underſtanding, how futile is the barbarity, and how ſad the folly of religious intolerance. Yet, ſo perverſe are the feelings of the vulgar, that the Engliſh Proteſtants ſeemed to riſe from under the wheel of perſecution, with renewed vigour, to perſecute. Every inſtance of popiſh bigotry has been recorded, not to deter from bigotry, but to juſtify a ſimilar indulgence of depraved and malignant paſſions, under the ſpecious pretexts of retaliation and precaution.

True it is, there is no more difficult taſk than to ſuppreſs thoſe feelings of vengeance which may ariſe from a natural ſource, but would be miſchievous if generally indulged. Yet, what elſe is the meaning of virtue? what elſe the advantage of liberal education, but that the crude and impetuous ſuggeſtions of firſt impreſſions, ſhould be diſciplined and regulated, by the calm concluſions and enlarged views of moral utility?

ELIZABETH.

ELIZABETH.

THE Iriſh rebellions in Queen Elizabeth's reign, have been generally aſcribed to the influence of Roman Catholic zeal; and this opinion has been maintained both by Catholic and Proteſtant writers.

This circumſtance might appear fatal to our argument, but this concurrence of opinion may be readily accounted for, even ſuppoſing the fact to have been otherwiſe.

For, thoſe authors who have been moſt poſitive in aſcribing theſe rebellions to religious principle, wrote in later times, when religious animoſity had acquired its greateſt rancour; and attributed the feelings of their own breaſts to the times that had paſt; while the Proteſtant writers endeavoured to fix a ſtigma on the Roman Catholic religion, by ſetting it forth as the cauſe of theſe rebellions: the Roman Catholic writers, with a zeal equally eager, but leſs judicious, boaſt of theſe rebellions as an index of the fervency of the Catholic faith.

The wretched bigot, O'Sullivan, records a murder committed by Sir John of Deſmond, on a Proteſtant, to whom he was much indebted, as "precla-

rum

rum facinus." * The Proteſtant bigot, Sir Richard Cox, relates as a very meritorious action, that Lord Mountjoy reduced the Iriſh papiſts to the neceſſity of eating one another.

We muſt turn from theſe writers, who can never be truſted in their ſtudied repreſentations, but when they involuntarily betray the truth, to the cotemporary writers, who ſaw the ſcenes which they deſcribe. Theſe, on the contrary, make little or no mention of any exiſting animoſity on account of religion, and ſo far from conſidering it as a cauſe of rebellion, they do not give the Catholics credit for it, even when they profeſſed it was ſo, but expreſsly declare it was never more than a pretext.

Though the haſty words of ſuch a man as the Earl of Eſſex cannot be pledged as hiſtorical fact, yet we may quote them with great reliance, as expreſſive of his feelings and the feelings of the times, when he replied to Hugh O'Neil, "Thou talk of a free exerciſe of religion! thou careſt as much for religion as my horſe."

The Earl of Deſmond's rebellion has alſo been aſcribed to his zeal for the Catholic religion. Let us hear what he ſays himſelf, and collect the degree of his religious enthuſiaſm from the very words of this redoubted polemic.

It

* This murder was committed by Deſmond to ingratiate himſelf with the Spaniards.

It was made a condition by the Lord Deputy, that the Earl ſhould promote the reformed religion in his territory. Deſmond replies, "That as to the furtherance of religion in Munſter, having no knowledge in *learning*, and being ignorant what was to be done in this behalf, he would aid and maintain whatever ſhould be appointed by commiſſioners nominated for this purpoſe?

As far as this rebellion is concerned, the teſtimony of Sir Richard Cox is deciſive; who, if he could have referred it to any thing like popery, would certainly have done ſo. He expreſsly allows that it aroſe from "the diſtaſte of the old Iriſh potentates, and old Engliſh ſettlers, who had been diſpoſſeſſed of their ſovereign rights, and that religion was only made a *pretence* for rebellion."

Moryſon gives the ſame account of the origin of the inſurrection under O'Neil. "About this time, the northern chieftains conſpired to defend the Romiſh religion; (for now, firſt among them, religion was made the *cloak* of rebellion,) *to admit no Engliſh ſheriffs*, and to defend their liberties and rights againſt the Engliſh."

Thoſe who have acquired from writers of later date an exaggerated idea of the fanaticiſm of the Iriſh Roman Catholics during the reign of Elizabeth, will be ſurpriſed to hear that there were no recuſants till the reign of James I. This is a moſt important

fact

fact—a decisive proof that the growth of religious animosity in the Irish Catholics was gradual—that it did not arise from the establishment of a Protestant government, but from the intolerance of that government. This singular circumstance has escaped the attention and candour of every Irish historian, and is only casually mentioned by Sir Richard Cox; his words are, "it must be observed that till this time (Ann. 1604) the papists generally did come to church, and were called church papists."

Another fact, scarcely less decisive in proving that rebellions arose, not from Catholic zeal, but from Protestant intolerance, is, that during the reign of Elizabeth (when in Ireland intolerance was yet young), the Roman Catholics of the Pale, who considered themselves as of English descent, invariably fought against the Roman Catholics without the Pale, whom they considered as *mere* Irish. Roman Catholic and Protestant had not yet become the badges of a party. It was the English and the Irish-English, without distinction of Protestant and Catholic, waging war against what were termed, the mere Irish, and the degenerate English. It was on one side, a powerful government, possessed with the spirit of rapine, invading property and privileges not its own; it was, on the other side, a band of feeble, but lawful princes, fighting without hope, yet with pertinacity, because they fought for power and independence.

Religion was nothing to the purpoſe. The Engliſh never mentioned it; the Iriſh only appealed to it as a known means of acquiring money and ſupplies from the Pope and the King of Spain. To lay ſtreſs upon religion, where paſſions and intereſts ſo much nearer to the human heart were at work, reminds me of a bon vivant who ſwallowed all manner of good things till he was fifty, and then attributed an attack of the gout, to eating too plentifully of water creſſes.

There is no reaſon to believe that a ſingle reſpectable Roman Catholic of the Pale, engaged in any rebellion, from attachment to his religon, during Queen Elizabeth's reign; on the contrary, they fought againſt the Iriſh, notwithſtanding their common faith, with as much zeal as they had done for the four preceding centuries. O'Sullivan, a bigoted papiſt, reproaches them for doing ſo. Speaking of the reign of James I. he ſays, "And now the eyes even of the Engliſh-Iriſh (*i. e.* the Catholics of the Pale) were opened, and they curſed their former folly for helping the heretic."

The Engliſh government were ſo ſenſible of the loyalty of the Iriſh-Engliſh Catholics, that they entruſted them, as uſual, with the moſt confidential ſervices. The Earl of Kildare was the principal inſtrument in waging war againſt the chieftains of Leix and Offaly. William O'Bourge, another Catholic, was created Lord Caſtle-Connel for his eminent ſervices;

ſervices; M'Gilly-Patrick, a prieſt, was the ſtate ſpy.

The Engliſh government never betrayed any apprehenſions on account of popery, but attributed the rebellions entirely to national feelings. In almoſt every letter of inſtructions to a Lord Deputy or a General, ſtrong fears and jealouſy are ſhewn of the *Iriſhry*, but never of the *papiſts*. The Queen herſelf perpetually remonſtrated on the impolicy of employing Iriſhmen in the army, and after the defeat of Marſhal Bagnell, gave directions that it ſhould be cleared of them; but never mentions Catholics as objects of ſuſpicion.

When Sir Henry Hannington was defeated by the O'Briens, Pierce Walſh was ſuſpected of treachery and executed, becauſe he was an *Iriſhman*, as it is ſaid, not beeauſe he was a Catholic.

The Lord Deputy ſpeaking of Sir Cormac M'Teige, of Muſcry, ſays, that " for his loyalty and civil diſpoſition, he was the rareſt man that ever was born of the *Iriſhry*." Every where we find that the being Iriſh, not the being Catholic, was ſuppoſed incompatible with loyalty.

To theſe facts we have to add the teſtimony of another cotemporary, and certainly a man of penetration, Sir George Carew. In his letter to Sir Robert Cecil, he takes pains to prove, that ambition,

not religion, was the cauſe of the rebellions—that the chieftains of Engliſh race fought to maintain the independent ſovereignty they had been permitted to acquire; that the Iriſh fought to maintain or recover their monarchy and provincial kingdoms, which they inherited from their anceſtors.

Thus far the Roman Catholic religion muſt ſtand acquitted of being neceſſarily a diſturber of the public peace, under a Proteſtant government; and thus far we have refuted thoſe ſuperficial and uncandid writers who have attributed the great rebellions during Elizabeth's reign, to the factious ſpirit of popery. But to leave no doubt upon the ſubject, it may be deſirable to produce the real cauſes of theſe rebellions, and to prove that they are ſufficient to account for theſe calamities, without any reference to religion.

Theſe cauſes, it will appear, were nearly the ſame as thoſe which produced ſimilar effects in the preceding reigns.

1ſt. The general averſion which every nation has to be governed by a foreign country.

2dly, The particular hatred conceived by the Iriſh againſt the Engliſh, on account of injurious uſage.

3dly, The confiſcations of property which had taken place, to the ruin of entire ſepts.

4thly,

4thly, The intention manifeſted by the Engliſh government, of quelling the uſurped power and princely independence of the chieftains of Engliſh deſcent.

5thly, The hoſtility of the Engliſh government to the Iriſh princes, and the intention openly avowed, of deſtroying all their ſovereign rights.

The firſt cauſe aſſigned is ſo generally felt, that it requires no particular comment, though its influence muſt at all times be, and is unfortunately even to this day, very conſiderable.

Of the ſecond cauſe, a multitude of inſtances might be brought, but very few leading points will be ſufficient. Sir John Davis relates, that it was held no crime to kill a *mere* Iriſhman, and mentions two or three inſtances of the murderer being acquitted, on its being proved, that the ſufferer had not been naturalized. The property alſo of the Iriſh, was placed without the pale of law, and the moral of the moſt part of the military hiſtory of the Engliſh, is getting a *great prey of cows*. The treatment of the Iriſh hoſtages, being generally the ſons or near relations of chieftains, was particularly ſevere; and whenever theſe unhappy chieftains themſelves fell into the hands of the Engliſh, their murder, for it can be called nothing elſe, was too generally the conſequence. O'Rourke, the great chieftain of Leitrim, was delivered up by the king of Scotland,

Scotland, and hanged by Elizabeth in London. The treatment of M'Mahon we ſhall notice preſently; theſe executions muſt have been regarded with particular horror by the Iriſh, as they themſelves had no capital puniſhments, and ſuch was their veneration for the perſons of their chieftains, that when Hugh O'Neil, (who had learnt the cuſtom in England,) ordered Hugh Gavelock's head to be cut off for informing againſt him, he could not find an executioner among his own ſubjects.

There is a fine reply of an old chieftain, who when brought to Dublin, was brutally ſhewn his ſon's head fixed on a pole: "My ſon," ſaid he, turning from the horrid ſpectacle, "my ſon has many heads."

Wherever the Iriſh were mentioned in the acts of parliament, it was to mark them out not merely as enemies, (though that was their appellation,) but as ſomething wholly out of the contemplation of the common rules of law and morality. *

Baron

* Until the reign of Henry VII. the term rebel was never applied to the Iriſh, but only to the degenerate Engliſh. "The Iriſh, *enemy*; the Engliſh rebels," was the diſtinction always made uſe of (ſee Sir John Davis). This is a clear proof that the Iriſh were not conſidered as ſubjects by the Engliſh government of that period. Even from the reign of Henry VII. till that of James I. the civil ſituation of the Iriſh was very equivocal,

or

Baron Finglas, in his Breviate of Ireland, gives ſeveral plans for the *improvement* of that country; one of them is, that no merchant do ſend any manner of wares among Iriſhmen, to be ſold, on pain of forfeiture of the ſame."

Yet there appears nothing in the character of the Iriſh, to juſtify this exceſs of hoſtility and cruelty. Until the reign of Charles I. when religious perſecution had ſoured their diſpoſition, they ſeem to have maintained a very marked ſuperiority over the Engliſh, in point of humanity and generoſity; and this appears more ſtriking, when we conſider, that the principal hiſtorians are Engliſhmen who would naturally favour their own countrymen, and diſparage the Iriſh; yet while they record the moſt atrocious actions committed by the Engliſh, ſuch as the aſſaſſinations of Lord Mountjoy, and Sir G. Carew, they mention no inſtances of retaliation, or of ſimilar brutality on the part of the Iriſh.

The Iriſh probably poſſeſſed the virtues, as well as the vices which flow from elective monarchy.

While in their conteſts for their petty thrones, every ſpecies of violence and bloodſhed was made uſe of, and ſeemed juſtified by eſtabliſhed uſage; in their

or rather was expoſed to the evils, both of a ſtate of ſlavery and hoſtility, ſo well deſcribed by Tacitus:

"Habent ſubjectos tanquam ſuos, vites ut alienos."

their private characters, they poſſeſſed that generoſity, humanity, and affability, which was neceſſary to conciliate the affections of their ſept.

A very amiable trait appears early in the Iriſh character, which has been very little noticed. On the firſt invaſion of the Engliſh, we are told by Leland, that a ſynod of the church was held, to conſider what national ſin it was which had brought upon their heads this terrible viſitation. It was unanimouſly reſolved, that it aroſe from the traffic which at that time was carried on in *Engliſh ſlaves*, and with a generous compunction which has ſince been very ill requited, this *ſlave trade* was aboliſhed. A people who could reaſon thus, were certainly no barbarians; and when we conſider the extreme humanity of their laws, which in no inſtance allowed the ſhedding of blood; we may conceive with what abhorrence they muſt have beheld that licentious ſyſtem of Engliſh cruelty, which has been ſo minutely detailed by the principal inſtrument of its exerciſe, the author of the Paccata Hibernica.

The third cauſe is, of all, the moſt important.

It has already been explained, that if the Engliſh government had extended the protection of its laws to the different ſepts, it would have found no difficulty in overturning the power of the Iriſh chieftains without ſhedding a drop of blood. This power was founded upon cuſtoms and laws ſo deſtructive to the property

property and ſecurity of the wretched vaſſals, that they would gladly have transferred their ill requited allegiance to the foſtering controul of Engliſh law; certainly when once they had ſubmitted to it, and taſted the ſweetneſs of an impartial adminiſtration of juſtice, of the ſecure poſſeſſion of property, and the valuable privilege of tranſmitting it to their children, they never would have revolted, to ſubmit to a ſlavery which had no recommendation from intereſt, or perſonal ſecurity.

But when the government, by a moſt cruel and abſurd implication, confounded the ſept with the chieftain, and becauſe *he* reſiſted, confiſcated their property; they took from them more than they could ever make a recompenſe for, and created a common intereſt with their tyrant, whom it otherwiſe would have been more natural for them to deſert, when the enjoyment of a more lenient government was within their reach.

But, the object of the Engliſh government at that time, was plunder, and confiſcation; they deſpiſed the natives too much to conſider them as objects of care or civil improvement; they were only ſolicitous to improve every pretext for making forfeitures.

We have ſeen that the territories of Leix and Offaly, were confiſcated under Edward VI. and the ſepts, as well as their leaders, baniſhed or deſtroyed.

This

This circumſtance had given riſe to frequent rebellions under Mary; and as well as we can collect, the ſepts, viz. the O'Moors, and O'Connors, had ſucceeded in a certain degree in recovering part of their poſſeſſions by force of arms.

The reign of Elizabeth began ominouſly for Ireland. Her firſt inſtructions to Lord Suſſex were, for "the diſtribution of Leix, Offaly, together with Iry, Glanmacaliry, and Slemergie." By the memorial of Sir J. Perrot, we find that all theſe *lands* were made *eſtates in tail to Engliſhmen.*

We have ſeen that the Engliſh government had influenced the chieftain Con. O'Neil, to ſurrender his territory, and take back a grant of it, with remainder to his baſtard ſon Matthew, and his iſſue, inſtead of his legitimate ſon, Shane O'Neil. This policy exactly reſembled what the Engliſh government has practiſed in later times in India; they raiſed a perſon to the throne, in violation of the cuſtomary mode of ſucceſſion, who depended for his ſtation on their power, who was ſtrictly a dependant, and might be ſet aſide whenever a favourable opportunity occurred. * Upon the death of the father,

* The ſame policy was adopted by the late Empreſs of Ruſſia, in the conqueſt of the Crimea. Her directions were to ſupport the weaker chieftains of the Tartars againſt the ſtronger, and to take every opportunity of appointing chieftains in the intereſt of Ruſſia. There is nothing peculiar in the Hiſtory of Ireland,

or

father, Shane O'Neil was elected chieftain according to ancient uſage. The Engliſh made war againſt him as an uſurper; he is ſlain by treachery; and his territory, which in the eye of the Engliſh government itſelf, could not, by its own act, be conſidered as belonging to him, but to the iſſue of the baſtard Matthew, was confiſcated for his ſuppoſed rebellion; and the iſſue of Matthew, who had been guilty of no rebellion, were left deſtitute! So that in order to diveſt Shane, the territory was reputed Matthew's; and in order to get rid of Matthew's claim, the territory was confiſcated as Shane's.

But in fact it belonged to neither. It was the great province of Ulſter, which the chieftain poſſeſſed as a king, not as a landlord, and drew his revenue from various imports on the groſs produce of the territory, and not from the territory itſelf.

The lands belonged to the ſept, and were held by them in joint tenancy. To talk of confiſcating the lands of Shane O'Neil, was the ſame as if the emperor of Auſtria was to confiſcate the lands of the elector of Bavaria, to diſpoſſeſs every old proprietor, and let every acre of ground to undertakers. To confiſcate the moſt flouriſhing quarter of Ireland was even then much more eaſy to decree, than effect; and though this monſtrous exploit was perpetrated

or in the nature of the Iriſh; it is the hiſtory of ſpoliation, of reſiſtance and ſuffering, which has taken place in ſo many nations, whoſe only fault has been their weakneſs.

trated in the end, yet at firſt, it was more within the meaſure of the cupidity of the Engliſh government, than its power.

Yet the confiſcation was decreed, and Elizabeth, with all the rapaciouſneſs of a land pirate, took a ſhare in the adventure.

The account is curious.

"On the 9th of July, 1573, the Queen granted the Earl of Eſſex the half of the ſignories of Clanneboy and Ferney, &c. &c. The Earl was to go thither with 200 horſe, and 400 foot, and maintain them for two years. Afterwards the Queen and Earl were to keep an equal military force at their ſeveral expence, for the defence of their reſpective ſhares. Each was to bear an equal charge for erecting fortifications. Afterwards, diviſion was to be made by commiſſioners, and then each might for twenty years build on her or his reſpective ſhare, as they pleaſed: each might diſpoſe of five thouſand acres as they pleaſed; the Earl was to be Captain-general for ſeven years, and was to plant his part, as well as the Queen hers, until there ſhould be a thouſand Engliſh inhabitants in each moiety.

The royal and lordly robbers took their meaſures with the dupli ity of conſcious villainy. The Lord Deputy, Sir illiam Fitzwilliams, was inſtructed to give out that Eſſex came to repel the Scots, and not

to

to hurt the *Iriſh*. In conſequence he was joined by Bryan Mac Phelemy; who ſoon deſerted him, probably on diſcovering his real views. The expedition failed, as likewiſe did another fitted out by Sir Thomas Smith, who ſent his natural ſon to make a plantation in the Ardes. As if theſe meaſures were not ſufficient to force the miſerable natives to take up arms, freſh inſtructions were ſent to let Leix and Offaly to Engliſh undertakers.

Can we be ſurpriſed to read in the next page that "The Lord Deputy found Ulſter in a flame?" or are we to allow that the flame was kindled by Catholic zeal?

The rebellions of the Cavenaghs, of the Knight of the Glynns, and of the Seneſchal of Imokilly, aroſe from the ſame cauſe. Barry of Barryſcourt was deſpoiled of his territory merely on a *complaint* being preferred againſt him by Raleigh. Sir Peter Carew ſet up an antiquated claim to half the kingdom of Cork, which was ſupported by the Lord Deputy and Council, although they were ſufficiently aware of its probable effects, as, "Sir Peter was adviſed not to *alarum* the Iriſh by beginning with them firſt."* But the claims of the Queen, who ſeems to have had an eager ſpirit for rummaging into the ragged

* This claim of Sir Peter Carew's, which was allowed, was from ſo diſtant a date as the reign of Edward III. Sir Peter obtained a large conſideration by way of compromiſe, from the actual holders of the property.

ragged title deeds of the Iriſh, were more formidable. If priority of poſſeſſion could make a good title, the Iriſh had the beſt in the world, as their genealogical tree was full of fruit before the other nations of Europe had thought of planting one.

But this title the Engliſh maintained, was deſtroyed by the confiſcations which took place after the ſucceſſes of the Engliſh arms. The Iriſh might have replied by the ſame rule, when they re-conquered the lands that had been confiſcated (which they had done,) the right derived by the Engliſh from confiſcation, ſhould merge in ſuperior right of conqueſt. But unluckily the Iriſh, according to their own proverb, had to go to law with the devil when the court was held in hell. We find directions from the Queen to eſcheat granted lands; to eſcheat lands which chieftains had ſurrendered, and which had been regranted to them, if the Queen or any other perſon could ſhew a title to them; which muſt always have been the caſe, as a previous confiſcation was always held to be a title, and there was ſcarce an acre of land in Ireland but what had been confiſcated.

After the defeat of the Earl of Deſmond, and the confiſcation of that quarter of Ireland called Munſter, the Queen advanced a ſtep farther in the deſtruction of every ſecurity of property.

There were ſome men of property who had ſenſe enough neither to care about the Earl of Deſmond

or

or the Queen—who had not taken arms, and whoſe property could not be decently confiſcated. The Queen thought they might be inconvenient in her plan of making a colony in Munſter; and therefore required them to prove their titles; which if they could not do to the ſatisfaction of her commiſſioners, they were turned out; and which, if they could do, why they were turned out too; only they were to be inſulted by a compenſation, allotted by theſe ſame commiſſioners, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Meagle, "meet men, and apt in the profeſſion of the law."

Are we to be ſurpriſed, that a freſh rebellion* broke out? or is this too to be aſcribed ſimply to the effect of Popiſh zeal?

The fourth cauſe we have aſſigned for the rebellions in Elizabeth's reign, was the intention ſhewn by Elizabeth, to reduce the old chieftains of Engliſh blood who had become independent, and exerciſed princely prerogative, to the rank of mere ſubjects.

This was a difficulty which the Engliſh government had created for itſelf. It gave away the lands of the Iriſh with ſuch liberality to its own ſubjects and dependants, that it made them too great for ſubjects.

Ulſter

* The rebellion under James Fitz-Thomas, commonly called the Sugan earl. His proclamation, like that of O'Neil's, is full of devotion to the Catholic faith, evidently with the ſame view, to gain ſupplies from the Pope and the king of Spain.

Ulſter (a whole province) was given to John de Courcy; the county of Meath to Hugh Lacy. The kingdom of Cork was granted to Cogan and Fitzſtephens, the kingdom of Limerick to William de Braoſa; Sir Thomas de Clare obtained a grant of Thomond, Ottho de Grandiſon of Tipperary, Robert De la Poer of Waterford, and William Fitzadlem, of a large portion of Connaught. But a more material grant was the licence allowed to theſe men and their deſcendants, to raiſe troops, and take by force as much more territory as they were able. In conſequence of ſuch drains upon the ſources of pillage, the crown had no more to beſtow; every inch of land which had been obtained, or which it was poſſible to obtain by force, was engroſſed by the chieftains of Engliſh blood.

This event had taken place even as early as Edward III.'s reign ſo completely, that in order to ſatisfy the voracity of a horde of diſappointed adventurers, who had been drawn to Ireland on the ſpeculation of new confiſcations and grants, Edward was obliged to reſume the grants made in his and his father's reigns. This invidious meaſure gave riſe to the diſtinction of Engliſh by birth and Engliſh by blood, which afterwards produced ſo much animoſity. The Engliſh born in England, who paſſed over into Ireland to obtain civil employments or grants of land, were generally connected with ſome court influence, and obtained every thing worth having. While the old Engliſh by blood, born in Ireland, gradually loſt

loſt their connection with the government, and degenerated, as it was phraſed, into mere Iriſh.

Independent of the great property they had acquired, there was another foundation for the power of the Engliſh and Iriſh chieftains. Till the reign of Elizabeth, the Engliſh government was too weak at home to ſpare any great force for the protection of its colony in Ireland.* The defence of the pale reſted entirely with Iriſh-Engliſh chieftains who were conſtantly inured to war, and from their knowledge of the natives and of the country, were beſt acquainted with the mode of warfare that was adopted by them.

The Engliſh government was alſo extremely neceſſitous, and hence the means and burthen of raiſing and maintaining a military force, were left entirely to theſe chieftains. It is not ſurpriſing that they ſoon began to eſteem themſelves independent of a power which would at any time have ceaſed to exiſt but for their protection.

They adopted the cuſtoms and prerogatives of the Iriſh princes whom they had diſpoſſeſſed.

They not only levied armies, waged war, and made peace like other potentates, as the whim ſeized them, but they drew their revenues according to the

* This is extremely well explained by Sir J. Davis.

Iriſh mode of taxation, partly from tribute paid by dependant chieftains, partly by impoſts, called Bonnaught, Cutting, Coyne and Livery, Karnety, &c.

To mark ſtill ſtronger their total ſeceſſion from the controul of Engliſh juriſprudence, they adopted the Brehon law, they ſubmitted their property, and that of their dependants to the cuſtom of Gavelkind, as it has been improperly termed, more properly ſpeaking, "hodge podge;" and their rank of chieftain deſcended according to the law of taniſtry. All this the Engliſh government put up with very good humouredly, whenever it ſtood in need of theſe chieftains for defence againſt the native Iriſh; but whenever it occaſionally gained a little ſtrength, it was ſure to lay claim to its renegade ſubjects; and a continual ſource of jealouſy and bickering, and ultimately of very ſerious and ſanguinary wars aroſe to England, exactly in proportion to the rapine and ravage ſhe had committed in Ireland.

It is of no conſequence to our preſent enquiry whether the Engliſh government, or its degenerate ſubjects were in the wrong; we ſhall only obſerve, that the Engliſh-Iriſh chieftains had obtained a right by preſcription to their independence, as far as lapſe of time, and long poſſeſſion could eſtabliſh it: and as this is the firmeſt foundation of all right, there muſt have been great apparent hardſhip in requiring theſe chieftains to deſcend at once from the rank of princes, to that of mere ſubjects, at leaſt it muſt have appeared ſo to them; which is ſufficient for

for our purpoſe, as we wiſh only to prove that this ſenſe of injury, and not religion, was the cauſe of their rebellions.

A ſhort account of the riſe and fall of the houſe of Deſmond, will be ſufficient to ſhew the real cauſes of the rebellion of its laſt earl under the reign of Elizabeth.

At the time of Edward II. the Engliſh power in Ireland only maintained a paſſive exiſtence from the voluntary ſervices of Maurice Fitz-thomas of Deſmond. He was ſufficiently brave, but extremely poor; and receiving no ſupplies from England, he was obliged to adopt the Iriſh cuſtom of Coyne and Livery, or free quarters, for the ſupport of his army. This meaſure had its uſual effect; the inhabitants of Kerry, and of the counties of Limerick, Cork and Waterford, who were expoſed to it, were either murdered, or ſo haraſſed by extortions, that they left their poſſeſſions to ſeek a temporary ſecurity, where the country was not deſolated by a protecting army. Deſmond, his kinſmen, allies and retainers, entered into theſe poſſeſſions, and appropriated the lands to themſelves. Deſmond took what he liked for his own private property, and reſerved an Iriſh ſeigniory or the right of Bonnaught cuttings, &c. over the reſt. So that he raiſed his income from one thouſand marks per annum, to ten thouſand pounds per annum; an enormous ſum in thoſe days.

From this time the earls of Desmond assumed all the prerogatives of independent princes, refusing to attend parliament, levying taxes, making wars, and as they could find no precedent for their conduct in English law, they very naturally adopted the old Irish usages which were quite consonant to their views.

Their example was followed by nearly all the English families of considerable property, by the Burkes, Birminghams, Dexons, Geraldines, Butlers, Condrons, &c. who, in the stile of Irish royalty, assumed a fictitious firname in place of the title of prince. Such as M'William Eighter; M'Yoris, M'Costelo, M'Morris, M'Gibbon, M'Pheris, &c. They all had their particular nations and their tributaries; they levied taxes according to the Irish usages, and made wars when they pleased, and with whom they pleased. They met with very little interruption from the English government, which either regarded this assumption of independence with indifference, or was too weak to prevent it. Whenever it acquired a momentary strength, the Lord Deputy would catch hold of an earl of Desmond, and endeavour to attach him to the court, or hang him; which only served to keep alive the jealousy of these degenerate chieftains, against the English government. No steady or efficacious system was adopted to reduce their power, till it had acquired almost the sanction of prescription.

This

This was the ſtate of things when Elizabeth aſcended the throne, when every cauſe, which had ſo long repreſſed the natural energy of the Engliſh government, of that ſolid and ſpirited force which ariſes from wiſe and equal laws, was removed; while the Iriſh had not advanced a ſtep from the weak and impoveriſhed ſtate which had been engendered by tyrannical habits and abſurd laws. Elizabeth felt the difference, and knew her power, and proceeded to reduce theſe long eſtabliſhed dynaſties to the rank of ſubjects. Theſe unfortunate chieftains were too ignorant to comprehend what the power of England was, they only recollected how weak it had been. They had been in the habit of treating the threats of the Engliſh government with ſcorn, they had been ſucceſsful in throwing off its controul and repelling its aggreſſions by force.

Is there any thing miraculous, that when freſh threats were held out, and freſh aggreſſions prepared, they ſhould again have recourſe to force? What has this to ſay to religion?

Take the particular inſtance in this reign of Garet, the laſt earl of Deſmond. The Lord Deputy ſummoned him to reſign all the princely prerogatives which had been tranſmitted to him through a long line of anceſtors. He conſults his relations and feudatories, who unanimouſly adviſe him to reſiſt ſo *unreaſonable* a demand, and promiſe to maintain their advice by force of arms, againſt the Deputy or any other that *will covet the ſaid earl's inheritance*. Not one

word

word of religion. The Earl of Deſmond had always been conſidered as the leader of the Engliſh-Iriſh chieftains; he was the moſt powerful and wealthy, and ſtood moſt forward on the canvaſs. As long as his privileges were untouched, theirs remained ſecure, when he was attacked, their welfare was in jeopardy till the conteſt was ended.

On this head there was no doubt of the intentions of Elizabeth; and conſequently as ſoon as a ſmall force of Spaniards landed at Smerwick, the Earl of Deſmond and all his feudatories, turned their arms againſt the Lord Deputy.

But the Iriſh had at length to learn the difference between the force of a government, founded on wiſe laws, and the power of their dynaſties which reſted on principles, repugnant to juſtice, and common ſenſe. The forces of the Earl of Deſmond were defeated, diſperſed, annihilated; all compromiſe denied to him, becauſe, as it was admitted, his poſſeſſions were of too princely an extent to be reſcued from forfeiture. The wretched old man was hunted like a wild beaſt, from his foreſts and his caverns; he was ſurpriſed at length in a miſerable hut; his head was cut off; and out of compliment to the Queen, was conveyed to her, and impaled on London bridge.

All the Earl of Deſmond's property was confiſcated, and as it was convenient for the Engliſh government

vernment to conſtrue the ſovereignty he held over a large territory into property alſo, the eſtates of his clan, and his feudatories, were alſo confiſcated. That is, nearly the whole province of Munſter.

Hence we may trace the cauſe of the ſucceeding rebellion, without having recourſe to that which has been made a ſaddle for all horſes—religion.

The fifth cauſe for the rebellions under Elizabeth was the plan adopted by the Engliſh government, of deſtroying the power and privileges of the Iriſh princes.

When we conſider, that at the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, there were more than ſixty independent chieftains in Ireland, of whom the greater part were in fact kings, and poſſeſſed of unlimited power over their ſubjects, when we know the attempts that had been made, and were at this period abſolutely making, to reduce this band of ſovereigns, who traced their deſcent from the moſt remote antiquity, to the condition of ſubjects; inſtead of looking for imaginary cauſes of rebellion, one is ſurpriſed, that rebellions were not more frequent, and conducted with more unanimity. Why, during the early reign of Elizabeth, when the Engliſh force was inſignificant, when the reign of a woman could not appear formidable to men who excluded women from their own petty thrones; why, when the whole province of Ulſter was confiſcated; when the name

of

of O'Neil was aboliſhed, when the laws of taniſtry were pronounced treaſonable by the Engliſh law; why was there not a general union, and a prompt reſiſtance of all the Iriſh chieftains, to an aggreſſion, which aimed at the very foundation of all their princely rights?

The Engliſh government was in fact not ſo inimical to the Iriſh chieftains as it appeared; it was too conſcious of the injuſtice and weakneſs of its pretentions to act up to them. In the very act which pronounces the prerogatives of the Iriſh princes an uſurpation, and aboliſhes them as ſuch, a power was veſted in the Lord Deputy to re-grant the ſame by letters patent, with much greater privileges than the chieftain poſſeſſed by the rules of the Iriſh law.*

A chieftain poſſeſſed by the Brehon law, no property in the territory over which he ruled, except his patrimonial lands; he poſſeſſed the throne only as a life tenant; the ſucceſſion did not neceſſarily deſcend to his ſon; on the contrary, his ſucceſſor was generally elected by the ſept during his life, and in ſome degree divided with him, the influence of government.

Whereas

* The queen tacitly allowed the validity of the Iriſh dynaſties, by ſupporting any one ſhe could get to be a rival to the exiſting chieftains. Thus, ſhe had her O'Neil, her O'Donnel, and her O'Reily, whom ſhe made uſe of to ſow diviſions among the clans and divide their force.

Whereas if he agreed to hold his petty empire by letters patent from the Engliſh government, immenſe advantage accrued to him. All the duties and exactions cuſtomary by the Brehon law, were continued to him; and in addition, the lands of the whole ſept (by a moſt extravagant ſtretch of injuſtice) were made abſolutely his private property, and what was ſtill more gratifying, he was releaſed from the interference of an elected ſucceſſor, and his ancient prerogative and his new poſſeſſions were ſtrictly entailed on his eldeſt ſon.

From this ſtatement, one might be ſurpriſed that every chieftain did not immediately ſubmit to hold his territory by Engliſh tenure. But there were ſeveral cauſes to produce heſitation. Pride ſtrongly combated intereſt; and as the objects of intereſts are, after all, of no value except as they contribute to the gratification of pride, it is no wonder that in many inſtances the end was preferred to the means; and that the princely deſcendants of a line of kings preferred an honourable dominion, conferred by the free choice of their ſubjects, to a more lucrative grant beſtowed by an overbearing and foreign power. Beſides, the deſign of the Engliſh government was, at all events, to acquire a nominal ſupremacy over the Iriſh chieftains; and this once eſtabliſhed, to overthrow, when the opportunity offered, thoſe prerogatives which were ſuffered to remain. This could not entirely eſcape the jealouſy of the chieftains, and made them cautious how they ſurrendered for any

any momentary advantage their ancient title to their ſovereignty, which was too ſtrong in preſcription to be queſtioned.

Yet the ſnare had to a certain degree ſucceeded; and though few of the Iriſh chieftains had conſented to hold their territories by Engliſh tenure, yet their ſuſpicions were lulled, and their animoſities were diſarmed, till the deſigns of the Engliſh government became too glaring to be miſtaken.

This event took place on Sir William Fitzwilliam being appointed Deputy, Ann. 1589. We are informed by Fines Moriſon, (a bitter enemy of the Iriſh,) that "previous to Sir William's arrival, the kingdom was in the beſt ſtate it had been a long time; any chieftain readily attended, when ſummoned by the Lord Deputy, none of them were diſcontented; the country was plentiful in corn, cattle, and all manner of victuals." This ſtate of things was completely reverſed by the outrages committed by the Lord Deputy againſt the Iriſh lords, M'Tuathel and O'Dogherty, and the Iriſh chieftain M'Mahown.

Sir William had received information, that part of the treaſure on board the ſhips belonging to the Spaniſh armada, wrecked on the coaſt of Ireland, had fallen into the hands of the Iriſh in Munſter.

He entered the country, but being diſappointed of his booty, he ſeized on M'Tool and O'Dogherty, who

who of all the Ulſter lords, had been moſt faithful to the Engliſh, and put them into priſon.

The firſt refuſing to pay for his enlargement, continued priſoner till Sir William Ruſſel's government, who in pity diſcharged him; "but the old lord's heart was firſt broken, ſo that he ſhortly after died. The ſecond was releaſed, after two years impriſonment, not without paying for his liberty, as the Iriſh ſay."

"And at this hard uſage, all the great men of the Iriſh, (eſpecially in the northern parts,) did much repine."

But the murder of M'Mahon, prince of Monaghan, at length opened the eyes of the Iriſh chieftains to the deſigns of the Engliſh government, and ſhewed them that the ſword afforded better ſecurity for their rights, than an Engliſh patent.

M'Mahon, chieftain of Monaghan, had ſurrendered his country to Elizabeth, and, as was the cuſtom, received a re-grant of it to him and his heirs male, and in default of ſuch iſſue, to his brother Hugh. He died without iſſue, and Hugh took poſſeſſion. The Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam, proceeded to Monaghan, under pretence of giving M'Mahon ſecurity in his poſſeſſion. But as ſoon as he arrived there, he raiſed an accuſation againſt M'Mahon, for having two years before recovered ſome rent due to him by force of arms. This

by

by the law of the Engliſh pale was treaſon, but M'Mahon had never ſtipulated to be ſubject to the Engliſh law; on the contrary, the patents by which their territories were re-granted to the Iriſh princes, either formally acknowledged the validity of the Iriſh Brehon law, or tolerated it by a ſilence equally expreſſive.

"The unhappy M'Mahon, for an offence committed before the law which declared it capital, was eſtabliſhed in his country, was tried, condemned by a jury formed of private ſoldiers, and executed in two days, to the horror and conſternation of his ſubjects and the reſt of the Iriſh chieftains. His territory was diſtributed to Sir H. Bagnall and other Engliſh adventurers. Four only of the ſept ſaved their property!"

This event was well calculated to decide the Iriſh chieftains in taking up arms. "Certain it is," ſays Morriſon, "that upon Mac Mahon's execution, heart-burnings and loathings of the Engliſh government began to grow in the northern lords againſt the ſtate, and they ſhunned, as much as they could, to admit any ſheriffs, or any Engliſh to live among them."

The minds of the Iriſh princes had already been ſufficiently inflamed. Engliſh garriſons were forced on them under different pretences, which, removed from any reſponſibility, pillaged and laid waſte the ſurrounding country. The Engliſh ſheriffs were a yoke

yoke no leſs grievous: Eſtabliſhed under pretence of introducing a more equitable adminiſtration of juſtice, as ſoon as they were firm in their ſeats, their extortions and exactions, with leſs appearance of right, became more intolerable than thoſe of the native dynaſts. In the inſtructions to Lord Grey and to Sir John Perrot, the abuſes committed by the Engliſh garriſons appear to have been notorious. The dread of an Engliſh ſheriff had become ſo great in the Iriſh territories, though at firſt they were thankfully accepted, that his life was not ſecure. When Fitzwilliam propoſed to Mac Guire, Prince of Fermanagh, to ſend a ſheriff into his diſtrict, Mac Guire replied: "Your ſheriff ſhall be welcome, but let me know his Erick, that if my people cut off his head, I may levy it on the country."

A creature of the Lord Deputy, named Willis, was ſent as ſheriff, who according to Morriſon and Lee, "haraſſed the country with three hundred of the very raſcal and ſcum of the kingdom, which did rob and ſpoil that people, raviſh their wives and daughters, and make havoc of all."

Morriſon himſelf particularizes the tyranny of Engliſh ſheriffs as a leading cauſe of the ſucceeding confederation of the Iriſh dynaſts; and in their remonſtrance to Wallop and Gardiner, who were appointed to confer with them, they inſiſt upon being exempted from garriſons and ſheriffs. Even had the Engliſh garriſons and ſheriffs committed no abuſes,

the

the eagerneſs with which the Engliſh government ſeized every pretence to introduce them, muſt have worn a very equivocal appearance to the Iriſh chieftains; it might have proceeded from a wiſh to promote tranquillity and law, but it might alſo proceed from a deſign of ſubverting the prerogatives of the Iriſh dynaſts, and ſeizing on their territories.

This being the fact, it was difficult for men ſo immediately intereſted, to be entirely unaware of their danger, and the period faſt approached when it became neceſſary for them to forget their mutual feuds in their common peril, and make a laſt ſtruggle for their independence, their power, and their property.

The period was favourable, as far as common injuries could give union and vigour to their exertions.

The ſept of Mac Mahon, equally regretting their murdered chieftain, and abhorring the ſeneſchal ſet over them, were ripe for action. Mac Guire rouſed to arms, by the indignity he had ſuffered from ſheriff Willis, was only repreſſed by Hugh O'Neil, who had not yet thrown off the maſk.

The O'Connors and O'Moores had bravely conteſted the poſſeſſion of their native territories, Leix and Ophalia, and were now in great force.

The

The chieftains of the De Burghes, originally Engliſh, but who had long enjoyed the independence and abſolute prerogatives of Iriſh princes, had reſiſted the attempt of Sir Richard Bingham, to reduce them to the ſtate of ſubjects; alarmed for their independence, and grievouſly haraſſed (as we are told) by Wallop, by the late introduction of ſheriffs, their defeat was only productive of forced ſubmiſſion.

O'Rorke, who had been driven from his petty principality by Sir Richard Bingham, had taken poſſeſſion of Leitrim, and bid defiance to the Lord Deputy.

Shane M'Brian O'Neil had taken arms to recover an iſland and a barony wreſted from him by the Earl of Eſſex, who had impriſoned him till he ſurrendered them.

The inhabitants of Munſter, driven from their poſſeſſions by the Engliſh undertakers, had collected in force, and only waited an opportunity to recover their properties; they ſoon after elected James Fitzthomas, commonly called the ſugan earl of Deſmond, for their chieftain. He had the command of eight thouſand men, as we learn from the Pacata Hibernia; he was elected agreeable to the law of taniſtry, on condition of doing homage to O'Neil, and was in every reſpect, a prince contending for power, and not a bigot ſtriving to eſtabliſh a domineering religion.

But

But the moſt formidable ſupport of the Iriſh war, (for it is quite impoſſible to call it a rebellion, where there were more than ſixty kings of acknowledged right, though poſſeſſed of trivial territory, fighting for the exiſtence of their power) were the talents and courage of two principal chieftains, O'Donnel and O'Neil.* O'Donnel was a hero. O'Neil was ſomething ſtill better. With equal courage and perſeverance, he knew how to bend to circumſtances, and to ſupply by addreſs, the immenſe inferiority of force, which did not deter him from the daring attempt to releaſe his country from a foreign yoke.

Theſe men, whoſe characters have been baſely traduced by hiſtorians, too bigoted to be generous; wanted only a more ſplendid ſphere of action, to have ranked with the greateſt characters that great events have produced. However, granting it otherwiſe, it does not affect the preſent argument, which tends to ſhew, not that the Iriſh chieftains were heroes, but ſimply that they were not bigots.

Hugh O'Neil was the ſon of the baſtard Matthew, and in oppoſition to the Iriſh uſage of taniſtry (as we have already ſhewn) the dynaſty and foe of Ulſter was veſted in him on his father's death, by letters patent under the great ſeal. He committed no

* The kings in Ireland were ſixty and more. See Holland's inſertion in the text of Camden.

no act to forfeit his right, but becauſe Shane O'Neil rebelled, to whom in the eye of the Engliſh law Ulſter did not belong, it was confiſcated to the queen's uſe; and Hugh O'Neil ſuffered the penalty for another perſon's treaſon, and that perſon his opponent. The queen, however, was not then ſufficiently powerful to take poſſeſſion, and to complete the inconſiſtency; ſhe acquieſced in the election of another chieftain, Tyrlogh Lynogh.

On his death, Hugh O'Neil was inaugurated by a better title than the queen had to beſtow, the free election of the whole ſept, who from time immemorial had appointed their chieftains. O'Neil was too well acquainted with the Engliſh court, and knew he could only maintain his rights by force. After he had endeavoured to ſupply his inadequacy in military ſtrength by that policy which can alone give the weak the advantage againſt the ſtrong; he took the field, and gained a deciſive victory at Blackwater.

Hugh O'Donnel ſhared with him in the glory of the day; their anceſtors had always been enemies; it was an O'Neil who in Henry VII.'s reign, wrote to Hugh Roe O'Donnel. "Cur hoom mi keeſh no monna Curhir!" i. e. "Send me my tribute, or if you don't!"—To which O'Donnel replied, "Neel keeſh a gut urm, agus da beh!" i. e. "I owe you no tribute, and if I did!"

We have ſeen in the reign of Henry VIII. the Lord Deputy declaring O'Donnel independent of O'Neil; but when the Lord Deputy proceeded to declare O'Donnel's dependants alſo independent, it ſeems to have opened his eyes, for we hear of no more diſputes between the O'Donnels and the O'Neils.

The wrongs of Hugh O'Neil, a worldly and politic man, are not calculated to excite intereſt, but thoſe of the open, generous and ſpirited O'Donnel, will move any feelings but thoſe of a bigot. The father of Hugh O'Donnel, the powerful Prince of Tyrconnel, refuſed to admit an Engliſh ſheriff in his territory. The Engliſh government were too conſcious of the villainy of the attempt, and their want of any plea of right, to enforce it by arms. They had recourſe to means which would appear incredible, if the truth of the fact was not well authenticated. What muſt have been the general conduct of the Engliſh, when Sir John Perrot, who was *accuſed* of favouring the Iriſh, and who was beloved by the Iriſh, as comparatively a juſt and humane Deputy, when he contrived and boaſted of the following project:

A merchant of Dublin was inſtructed to feign himſelf a Spaniard, and to ſail up by Donegal into the territory of Tyrconnel, to ſhew an extraordinary courteſy to the natives, to invite and feaſt them in his ſhip.—If the old chieftain or his ſon came on board,

board, to intoxicate them, ſecure them under the hatches, and convey them to Dublin. The ſtratagem ſucceeded, and Hugh O'Donnel was the victim. And what was his treatment afterwards when policy could not point out any reaſon for farther cruelty? Take the account from Lee's memorial to the Queen:

"After the obtaining of him, his manner of uſage was moſt diſhonourable and diſcommendable, and neither allowable before God nor man. My reaſons are theſe: He being young, and being taken by this ſtratagem, having never offended, was impriſoned with great ſeverity, and many irons laid upon him, as if he had been a notable traitor and malefactor."

His impriſonment would have laſted for life, had he not found means to make his eſcape with the two ſons of Shane O'Neil and O'Reily. Hugh O'Donnel and Arthur O'Neil were hotly purſued; they were obliged to conceal themſelves in a faſtneſs without food, and expoſed to the cold of a ſevere winter. In this ſituation they remained four days, when they were diſcovered by their friends. Young O'Neil was expiring. Hugh O'Donnel, deprived of the uſe of his limbs by the ſeverity of the cold, was weeping bitterly over his friend, and endeavouring to preſerve his life by ſheltering him with his own body. Arthur O'Neil died. O'Donnel regained Tyrconnel, and ſwore eternal enmity to

the Engliſh. His father reſigned his power to him, and he was ſolemnly inveſted with the principality of Tyrconnel by the ſuffrages of his ſept.

Upon the defeat of the Engliſh at Blackwater, every Iriſh chieftain took arms. Morriſon gives a liſt of them and of their forces, which is alone ſufficient to prove that the Engliſh government could not, with any propriety, conſider them as ſubjects. Directed by O'Neil and O'Donnel, they defeated the beſt appointed army which had ever been ſent from England; and Eſſex, who commanded it, returned to England diſgraced. This was the only time that the fortune of Ireland ſeemed to gain the aſcendant. O'Neil, with an inferior force, had baffled the Engliſh by addreſs; he had now the ſuperiority, and his ſucceſs appeared certain. Every chieftain, whether of Iriſh or Engliſh extraction, ſaw that they could only hope to maintain their prerogatives and independence by force of arms, and their natural courage was inſtigated by every ſpur of pride and ſelf intereſt. The aſſiſtance of Spain was hourly expected. The ableſt of the Engliſh generals were cut off, and the Queen's army thought only of defending the Pale.

Lord Mountjoy was appointed Deputy in the room of Eſſex, and every thing was reverſed, Lord Mountjoy, under an effeminate exterior, poſſeſſed all the qualities neceſſary for conqueſt; courage, promptitude, cunning, unſhackled by probity; ſeverity

verity unalloyed by compaſſion. He made every means ſubſervient to his end, and opened his way by the cruelleſt perfidy and the moſt horrible and undiſcriminating havoc. His object was to take off the Iriſh chieftains by aſſaſſination, and to reduce the country by famine. But to make the reverſe of all their fortune as bitter as poſſible to the Iriſh, a ſeeming certainty of ſucceſs immediately preceded their complete ruin. Don Juan de Aguila landed at Kinſale with a large body of Spaniards. O'Neil and O'Donnel collected their armies, and Lord Mountjoy, with an inferior force, was hemmed in on all ſides. Don Juan intended to attack the Lord Deputy: in vain O'Neil urged the want of diſcipline in his troops, and the certainty there was of reducing the Lord Deputy by cutting off his ſupplies. The fate of Ireland was decreed. The attack was determined, the deſign was betrayed, the Spaniards did not act in concert, and O'Neil and O'Donnel were entirely vanquiſhed.

O'Donnel, and with few exceptions the whole body of Iriſh chieftains, diſdaining to live as ſubjects where they had ruled as kings, paſſed over into Spain, where they were received with all the reſpect due to their rank, and all the tenderneſs that could alleviate misfortune. O'Neil, confident in his reſources, maintained a ſhort and fruitleſs ſtruggle, and then followed their example. This is one of the moſt ſingular, and yet leaſt noticed, revolutions that ever took place in any country.

Sixty

Sixty princes, independent, and exerting kingly prerogatives from time immemorial, after a conteſt of five centuries, were in the courſe of ſix years ſwept from the face of their country by the ſuperior energy of an ambitious woman. They fought long and they fought bravely, and though vanquiſhed they did not yield. This was clearly a conteſt of power, not of religion. We cannot refuſe our ſympathy to their wrongs, their courage, and their misfortunes; but it is the perverſity of fanaticiſm, to applaud them for their piety, or to cenſure them for their bigotry. Religion was never appealed to by them, but as a pretext calculated to gain them money and ammunition from Spain and the Pope, and to throw an additional ſtigma on the name of Engliſhmen.

Yet, ſince we find the Catholic religion aſſuming a conſiderable degree of conſequence, as a principle of diſcontent in the ſucceeding reign; there can be no doubt that it had gained conſiderable hold of men's minds during the reign of Elizabeth. It is true, that at the beginning of the war, the being a papiſt was no cauſe of ſuſpicion; all the towns were peopled with Catholics and remained loyal; the Queen's army conſiſted moſtly of Catholics, and was generally commanded by Catholic officers; yet latterly apprehenſions were entertained of the loyalty of the cities and towns; at the ſame time this is mentioned as a matter of ſurpriſe. Sir R. Cox ſays "the very cities and towns were ſtaggering,

and

and ſo frightened by the threats of the clergy, that no truſt would be repoſed in them." O'Sullivan mentions it as a ſubject of regret, that only a few of the papiſts in the Queen's army revolted. Yet this ſhews that there was a certain degree of diſaffection connected with religion. Camden alſo relates, that many of the papiſts, who had been loyal, ſent to Rome for a "diſpenſation of this *crime*." When the young Earl of Deſmond was ſent by Elizabeth to Ireland, the people of Munſter at firſt received him with congratulations, but deſerted him on diſcovering that he was a Proteſtant.

Theſe are the moſt material inſtances we collect of the progreſs of Catholic bigotry during Elizabeth's reign, which prove that it exiſted in no great degree, yet that it did exiſt and had encreaſed.

The reaſons for this encreaſe appear to be theſe:

Firſt. The Proteſtant religion having met with no perſecution in Ireland, made no progreſs. The native Iriſh to a man remained Catholics, while the Proteſtants conſiſted entirely of Engliſh. Hence Engliſh and Proteſtant became ſynonimous terms, and by a natural aſſociation of ideas, the hatred entertained by the Iriſh to the Engliſh was continually transferring itſelf to the religion of the Engliſh; and, by the reverſe cauſe, their attachment to the Roman Catholic faith encreaſed, from its being the badge and peculiarity of their own body.

Secondly.

Secondly. In the war which they were waging, the chieftains derived the moſt important advantages from profeſſing and inculcating in their followers the moſt devoted attachment to the ſee of Rome.—O'Neil, though indifferent to religion himſelf, was too politic to forego ſo favourable a pretext, and declared himſelf the champion of the Roman Catholic religion: in conſequence, ſupplies of money and men were obtained from the Pope and the King of Spain. Vicars and Jeſuits were ſent over to Ireland, who, by the cuſtomary arts of zealots, awakened religious fanaticiſm; and gave effect to a bull of excommunication iſſued againſt Elizabeth by the Pope. Mac Egan, the Pope's Vicar, never allowed any Iriſh papiſt that ſerved the Queen to be pardoned when taken priſoner. The Iriſh chieftains, however, were never infected with this theological ſpirit; we hear of no murders or maſſacres of Proteſtants, as ſuch, though afterwards their enemies ſhed ſuch horror over the rebellion of 1641. Yet men, the moſt indifferent to the meaning of their own profeſſions, will inſenſibly be influenced by the conſtant repetition of them. Though at firſt the Iriſh chieftains eſpouſed the Pope's quarrel from policy, there is no doubt they became attached to it from principle, and the misfortunes they ſuffered while engaged in its cauſe, gave it that hold on their hearts which it never would have gained on their underſtandings.

The laſt reaſon ſeems to have been the diſtinctions drawn between Catholic and Proteſtant by the laws;

laws: theſe diſtinctions were comparatively trifling during the time of Elizabeth, and may be ſeen in the acts of the 2d of her reign. But nothing is trifling that wounds the vanity or pride of men, motives which influence their conduct much more than groſſer intereſts. They gave to O'Neil an opportunity of repeatedly demanding the free exerciſe of the Catholic religion, which claim (as is uſual) was refuſed with a pertinacity equal to its inſignificance.

This was ſufficient.

The practical perſecution, however, which was felt or feared by the Roman Catholics, was of greater extent.

In the pardon granted to the province of Munſter by Sir G. Carew, he tells us (in the Paccata Hibernia) that Prieſts and Romiſh religious perſons were excepted. The Prieſts were always murdered in cold blood, whenever a town or garriſon was taken. Sir C. Wilmot, when he took the Lord of Lixnaw's caſtles, only ſpared the Prieſt's life, to get poſſeſſion of the Lord of Lixnaw's child. Spencer ſpeaking of the ſtate of religion in Ireland, of which he had been an eye witneſs, delivers this juſt and admirable ſentiment, which ſhews that practical perſecution did exiſt: "In planting religion, thus much is needful to be obſerved, that it be not ſought forcibly to be impreſſed in them, *with terror and ſharp penalties,*

as

as is now the manner, but rather delivered and intimated with mildneſs and gentleneſs, ſo that it may not be hated before it be underſtood."

This maxim, however, was ſo little congenial to Engliſh juriſprudence, that, on the contrary Valentine Brown calmly recommended the extirpation of the Iriſh papiſts, as the beſt means of advancing the Reformation. Theſe reaſons appear ſufficient to account for the degree of Roman Catholic bigotry which appeared at the concluſion of Elizabeth's reign. But, as I imagine, that at this time was alſo formed that ſanguinary character which henceforth marks the Iriſh, and the Popiſh religion in Ireland. I ſhall plead no excuſe for digreſſing to point out its cauſe. This was the extreme ferocity with which this war of Elizabeth was carried on, againſt the Iriſh and the Iriſh chieftains.

Superiority and impunity are the only conditions neceſſary to develope the natural barbarity of the human heart, when its object is power. What we deſpiſe we appear to have a right to oppreſs. Hence, the nations which are themſelves the moſt free, prove the greateſt tyrants to their dependants. Hence the contempt which the white men in the Weſt Indies feel for the black, may be conſidered as partly the cauſe, as well as the effect, of the oppreſſion of the latter.

While the Iriſh were able to maintain a pretty equal ſtruggle with the Engliſh colony, that is, till the

the reign of Elizabeth, the common uſages and laws of war (unleſs they were very unſucceſsful) were preſerved towards them. But when the power and pride of the Engliſh became ſo highly exalted under Elizabeth, the Iriſh were conſidered as a ſort of rebel ſavages, clearly excluded from the contemplation of the laws of God and man, the violation of whoſe rights formed no precedent that could affect civilized nations; and it did not follow that a man who ſhould ſpoil and murder them might not be poſſeſſed of an upright and gentle heart.

Not to weary the attention with a repetition of cruelties, which would become monotonous in ſpite of their ſingular atrocity, we will confine our remarks to the policy and conduct of the Lord Deputy Mountjoy. He adopted the plan for reducing Ireland, pointed out, though not practiced, by the Earl of Eſſex: this was by the ſword and by famine. That there might be no ceſſation to military execution, the armies were kept on foot during the winter; ſallies were made from forts and garriſons, to prevent the ſowing of corn; every exertion was made to take or deſtroy the cattle, and in ſummer, the ſoldiers were employed to cut down the corn in the well-affected parts of the country, as well as the territories belonging to the chieftains in arms; no quarter was given in the battle, and priſoners taken in garriſons were murdered in cold blood. Whole diſtricts, from the ſmalleſt pretence were delivered up to the ſword.

Becauſe

Becauſe the Queen's troops could not kill faſt enough, no Iriſhman was pardoned, unleſs he undertook to murder his neareſt friend or relation. Lord Mountjoy's ſecretary relates that, "Lord Mountjoy never received any to mercy but ſuch as had ſo drawn blood on their fellow rebels." Thus Mac Mahon and Mac Artmoyle offered to ſubmit, but neither could be received without the other's head.

"I have, it ſeems," ſays Lord Mountjoy, "made ſome of them put themſelves *in blood* already; I hear that Lord Mountgarrett's ſons have killed ſome of Cloncare's and ſome of Tyrrill's followers: ſince I conteſted with their father, about ſomewhat I heard ſuſpicious of them."*

A ſingular account may be ſeen in the Paccata Hibernia, related by Sir G. Carew, of the attempt he made to aſſaſſinate the Sugan Earl, and his brother, by means of their friend Nugent. The plot failed, but it had the effect of ſowing miſtruſt among the chieftains; and as they never retaliated on the Lord Deputy or Lord Preſident, it became a received tactic in the warfare of thoſe days.

And now came the triumph of power.

"The

* When any of the Iriſh procured their pardon by theſe means, Lord Mountjoy placed them in the poſts of danger, and ſo got rid of them.

"The multitude, (as Sir J. Davis informs us) being brayed, as it were in a mortar, with the ſword, peſtilence, and famine, altogether became admirers of the crown of England."

"No ſpectacle, (ſays Morriſon,) was more frequent in the ditches of towns, and eſpecially in waſted countries, than to ſee multitudes of theſe poor people dead, with their mouths all coloured green, by eating nettles, docks, and all things they could rend above ground."

The very commanders, with ſome degree of conſiſtency, had to hang a parcel of old women, convicted of being cannibals, after they had reduced them to the neceſſity of becoming ſo. At length Sir Arthur Chicheſter was eye witneſs to three children feeding upon the dead body of their mother; and ſome compunction ſeems to have ariſen in the breaſts of the Engliſh when they found nature thus outraged by the effect of their meaſures.

The Queen exclaimed, that ſhe feared the ſame reproach might be made to her which was formerly made by Batto to Tiberius: "It is you, you that are to blame for theſe things, who have committed your flocks, not to ſhepherds, but to wolves."

Even Lord Mountjoy, the author of this ſyſtem of coercion, ſaw its folly and repented of it. In his letters to the Engliſh lords of council, he adviſes

ſincere

ſincere and perfect forgiveneſs to be granted to the Iriſh, complete toleration of religion, and great tenderneſs and liberality, in treating with the old Iriſh chieftains.

So that after all the waſte of life and money, Lord Mountjoy had not advanced a ſtep, but now equally felt the neceſſity of thoſe wiſe and conciliatory meaſures which, if adopted at firſt, would have made the war unneceſſary.

Lord Bacon, in a letter to Secretary Cecil, inculcates the ſame policy; and, with his uſual good ſenſe, objects to the too much letting of blood, (the panacea, ſo readily adopted by ſtateſmen of cold hearts, and muddy underſtandings) and inſiſts on the neceſſity of religious toleration.

It is quite terrible (and it is ſtill more ſhocking that the obſervation ſhould have become trite and common-place) how odious human nature appears in the recorded tranſactions of governments.* They ſeem

* The Engliſh government, in order to ſteel its heart againſt all the ſufferings of the Iriſh, concluded that the nature of the Iriſh was different from that of any other people, and only to be conciliated by hard uſage. Thus, they were ſaid to be like nettles, which would not ſting you if you ſqueezed them hard. Their very ſubmiſſion was conſidered as a ſymptom of rebellion, for

" Non genus ullum invenies, cui peccare
" Et flere magis naturale eſt."

Their ſufferings were ridiculed by the proverb of " *weeping Iriſh*," as if in any country an oppreſſive conqueror could rely with ſecurity on forced ſubmiſſion.

ſeem to have no humanity, nor even good nature, and their errors ſeem to ſpring juſt as much from a ſpirit of oppreſſion and revenge, as from folly. Elizabeth was certainly a highly gifted princeſs, yet if ſhe had never been known but by her adminiſtration in Ireland, ſhe might fairly have been ranked among the moſt oppreſſive and vindictive tyrants that have inſulted the feelings and outraged the intereſts of mankind.

JAMES I.

IF deſolation can be called tranquillity, tranquillity was the effect of Elizabeth's meaſures; yet the ſtate of peace which continued, with very trifling interruptions, during the whole reign of James, muſt, in juſtice, be aſcribed to the policy of this prince himſelf. It is true he exaſperated and encreaſed the new cauſes of rebellion, and ſome of the old; namely, thoſe which aroſe from religion and confiſcations; but at the ſame time, he removed the principal and moſt momentous ſpring of diſturbance, by effectually reducing the power of the old

Iriſh

Iriſh and old Engliſh chieftains. This, for the time, was the moſt material point; independence and liberty were well diſciplined topics and well underſtood, which upon any favourable opportunity could move the whole iſland to arms; whereas the natives had yet to learn the more refined and metaphyſical feelings, which bleed and feſter from the endurance of diſtinctions and privations on account of religion. It is therefore no wonder, that although James, in fact, laid as ſure a ground-work as any of his predeceſſors for *future* rebellions, his own reign was comparatively tranquil.

His firſt object was to deſtroy, not only the power but the very exiſtence of the old Iriſh and old Engliſh chieftains, and this he accompliſhed with admirable wiſdom. He eſpouſed the cauſe of their oppreſſed ſubjects againſt their chieftains. He held out to them the bleſſing of equal law, of the inviolability of their perſons, of the ſecure poſſeſſion of their properties, and its deſcent to their children. He ſtrengthened defective titles, and aboliſhed all diſtinctions between Engliſh and Iriſh; "whereupon, (ſays Sir John Davis,) ſuch comfort and ſecurity was bred in the hearts of all men, as enſured the calmeſt and moſt univerſal peace that ever was ſeen in Ireland." Can there be a more delightful, a more glorious contemplation, than to ſee a nation, a whole people, thus reſcued from ignorance, poverty, faction and war, and inſtalled in all the bleſſings of knowledge, wealth and peace, by

by the operation of a ſingle meaſure, and this after the ſame effect had been in vain attempted by force, and its neceſſary attendant, havoc.

This was perfected in Ireland by the too little celebrated Act of Oblivion, publiſhed by proclamation under the great ſeal; by this all offences againſt the Crown, and all particular treſpaſſes between ſubject and ſubject, done at any time before his Majeſty's reign, were pardoned, remitted, and utterly extinguiſhed, never to be revived or called in queſtion. And by the ſame proclamation all the Iriſh (who hitherto had been left under the tyranny of their lords and chieftains) were received into his Majeſty's protection. The oppreſſive exactions of the Iriſh chieftains on their ſubjects, their bonnaught, their coyne, and livery, cuttings and coſherings, were aboliſhed. Inſtead of granting to a chieftain, who ſurrendered his chiefry, the whole territory of the ſept in perpetuity, as had hitherto been done, he was only allowed his patrimonial property, which was generally very ſmall, and a compenſation in money for the tributes, exactions, and ſervices due to him.

The common Iriſh were ſtudiouſly inſtructed that they were free ſubjects to the kings of England, and not ſlaves or vaſſals to their reſpective chiefs; that the tributes and extortions exacted from them were not lawful, and that they ſhould no longer pay them; they gave a willing ear to theſe leſſons,

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München

" and therefore," ſays Davis, " the greatneſs and power of theſe Iriſh lords over the people ſuddenly fell and vaniſhed, when their oppreſſions and extortions were taken away, which did maintain their greatneſs, inſomuch, as divers of them who formerly made themſelves owners of all by force, were now, by the law, reduced to this point, that wanting means to defray their ordinary charges, they reſorted to the Lord Deputy, and petitioned for a competent maintenance. But ſome of them being impatient of this diminution, fled out of the realm to foreign countries; whereupon we may well obſerve, that as extortion did baniſh the old Engliſh freeholder, who could not live but under the law, ſo the law did baniſh the Iriſh Lord, who could not live but by extortion."

This enlarged policy, which deſtroyed the Iriſh chieftains, as if by magic—this ſyſtem, at once ſo ſimple and ſo effectual, never entered into the contemplation of James's predeceſſors. When they ſeized on the poſſeſſions of a conquered chieftain, they confiſcated alſo the whole property of his ſubjects; in order to win only a ſeeming dependance, and to procure a nominal ſurrender of his authority, they re-granted to him not only his own lands, but the lands of all his ſubjects, leaving him in full poſſeſſion of all his ancient tyranny, tribute and exactions. When they ſought to deſtroy a chieftain, they raiſed up and ſupported a rival, by which they tacitly acknowledged the legality of thoſe petty ſove-

reigns

reigns—thus Queen Elizabeth had her O'Donnel, her O'Neil, her Maguire, her O'Reily. Whenever they interfered, they left the condition of the Iriſh worſe than before. They held the Iriſh in too much contempt to have any intereſt in their welfare; and this good effect at leaſt aroſe from the deſperate reſiſtance made by the Iriſh againſt Elizabeth, that they gained a certain degree of reſpectability, which ſeemed to entitle them to the ſolicitude of government. James reſcued them from oppreſſion, and raiſed them from the ſtation of the ſlaves of petty deſpots, to the higheſt rank of men, free Britiſh ſubjects.

If a dog were treated with barbarity, one would feel an inclination to take his part. One cannot but pity the misfortunes of the Iriſh chieftains, and ſometimes one muſt admire the virtues which thoſe misfortunes called forth; one cannot but deteſt the mean perfidy, the rapacity and cruelty of their oppreſſors; yet as far as we can judge from the ſcanty annals of the country, they were the ſcourge of their own ſubjects, and Ireland ſtands deeply indebted to England for their overthrow.

James conferred a ſtill greater benefit on Ireland, by the abolition of the Brehon laws of property.

After reading every account of Iriſh hiſtory, one great perplexity appears to remain: How does it happen, that from the firſt invaſion of the Engliſh

till the reign of James I. Ireland ſeems not to have made the ſmalleſt progreſs in civilization or wealth? That it was divided into a number of ſmall principalities, which waged conſtant war on each other; or that the appointment of the chieftains was elective, do not appear ſufficient reaſons, although theſe are the only ones aſſigned by thoſe who have been at the trouble of conſidering the ſubject; neither are the confiſcations of property quite ſufficient to account for the effect; there have been great confiſcations in other countries, and ſtill they have flouriſhed; the petty ſtates of Greece were quite analogous to the chiefries (as they were called) in Ireland; and yet they ſeemed to flouriſh almoſt in proportion to their diſſenſions. Poland felt the bad effects of an elective monarchy more than any other country, and yet in point of civilization, it maintained a very reſpectable rank among the nations of Europe; but Ireland never, for an inſtant, made any progreſs in improvement till the reign of James I.

The cauſe of this extreme poverty, and of its long continuance, we muſt conclude, aroſe from the peculiar laws of property, which were in force under the Iriſh dynaſties. Theſe laws have been deſcribed by moſt writers as ſimilar to the Kentiſh cuſtom of gavel-kind, and indeed ſo little attention was paid to the ſubject, that were it not for the reſearches of Sir J. Davis, the knowledge of this ſingular uſage would have been entirely loſt.

The

The Brehon law of property, he tells us, was ſimilar to the cuſtom (as the Engliſh lawyers term it) of hodge podge. When any one of the ſept died, his lands did not deſcend to his ſons, but were divided among the whole ſept; and for this purpoſe the chief of the ſept made a new diviſion of the whole lands belonging to the ſept, and gave every one his part according to ſeniority. So that no man had a property which could deſcend to his children; and even during his own life, his poſſeſſion of any particular ſpot was quite uncertain, "being liable to be conſtantly ſhuffled and changed by new partitions." The conſequence of this was, that there was not a houſe of brick or ſtone among the Iriſh, down to the reign of Henry VII.; not even a garden nor orchard, nor well fenced nor improved field, neither village or town, nor in any reſpect the leaſt proviſion for poſterity.* This monſtrous cuſtom,

* Warner gives the ſame account of this ſingular and pernicious law, on the authority of an old Iriſh manuſcript. He ſays that "upon every death, the poſſeſſions of the whole ſept were put together, and again divided among the ſurvivors by the head, or couſinny, which diveſted each of them of his eſtate upon every new diviſion. The couſinny would refuſe to admit a tradeſman to a ſhare of his eſtate, as he had thereby *degraded* himſelf.

The reaſon of theſe perpetual ſubdiviſions was, that each country, not having a revenue to maintain an army, the number of freeholds enabled a greater number of freeholders to maintain themſelves; and as every holder of land was a ſoldier, the oftener a freehod divided, the greater number of men at arms.

tom, ſo oppoſite to the natural feelings of mankind, was probably perpetuated by the policy of the chiefs. In the firſt place, the power of partitioning being lodged in their hands, made them the moſt abſolute of tyrants, being the diſpenſers of the property, as well as of the liberty of their ſubjects. In the ſecond place, it had the appearance of adding to the number of their ſavage armies, for where there was no improvement or tillage, war was purſued as an occupation.

In the early hiſtory of Ireland we find ſeveral inſtances of chieftains diſcountenancing tillage, and ſo late as Elizabeth's reign, Morriſon ſays, that "Sir Neal Garve reſtrained his people from ploughing, that they might aſſiſt him to do any miſchief." *

If it were not foreign to our preſent purpoſe, we could wiſh to dwell longer on this ſubject; it is fertile in profitable contemplation to every Iriſhman; for at the ſame time that we would not let a fault paſs uncenſured in the vile ſyſtem of government practiſed by the Engliſh in Ireland, we would ſtill maintain its ſuperiority over the barbarous tyrannies it diſplaced. We wiſh to repreſs the headlong and unmethodiſed deſire for a ſeparate and national government which pervades Ireland, and ſuggeſt a doubt whether modern chieftains would not be as liable

* Con O'Neil, ſirnamed Bacco, denounced a curſe upon ſuch of his poſterity as ſhould ſow corn or build houſes. See Camden.

liable to make as fatal errors in their civil code, as theſe which have been pointed out in the Brehon laws, and which Iriſhmen ſtill attempt to extenuate and affect to admire. From the ſpecimens left by the leaders of late rebellions, we have little doubt they would, and leſs doubt that the conſequence would be a proportionate return to the degraded level of induſtry, morals, and manners, which exiſted during the ſavage independence of Ireland.

James enforced the laws of England throughout Ireland, extended the protection of government to the lower orders, and ſecured every man in poſſeſſion of his property. Theſe meaſures at once put an end to the power of the Iriſh chieftains, and extinguiſhed the immediate cauſe of rebellions.

James himſelf enjoyed a tranquil reign, but unfortunately for his ſucceſſor, he created or inflamed other cauſes of rebellion, which proved more inveterate than the animoſity of the old chieftains. Theſe conſiſted in enormous confiſcations of property, and in a decided hoſtility commenced againſt the Roman Catholics.

Upon the flight of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, 500,000 acres (which by the bye did not belong to them, but to their vaſſals) were confiſcated; and to this cauſe may be fairly aſcribed the ſhare which Sir Phelim O'Neil took in the rebellion in the ſucceeding reign. However, to do James

juſtice,

juſtice, he avoided ſeveral errors which had been committed in former diſtributions of confiſcated lands. He included a large proportion of native Iriſh in the grants, and allowed to none of the undertakers, thoſe large proportions which engendered petty deſpots, and gave them a conſequence that diſdained the controul of laws. James, as a planter, ſaw the expediency of toleration, and exempted his Roman Catholic tenants from taking the oath of ſupremacy.

Sixty-ſix thouſand acres were ſeized on between the river of Arklow and the Slane; three hundred and eighty-five thouſand acres in the counties of Leitrim, Longford, Weſtmeath, Leix and Offaly; and by regranting large proportions to the old inhabitants on permanent tenures, theſe meaſures were carried with apparent tranquillity. So far James ſeems to have been actuated by a colonizing Quixotiſm; and though his view of objects was falſe, his intention was liberal and good. But at the latter end of his reign he was gradually led from confiſcating people's property for their intereſt, to confiſcate for his own; and had recourſe to an outrage which for its practical villainy, and its diſaſtrous conſequences, can ſcarcely be paralleled.

James's revenue in Ireland fell ſhort ſixteen thouſand pounds per annum, in thoſe days thought a terrible deficiency. To ſupply this he had recourſe

to

to the following device, which was aimed at the inhabitants of an entire province.

The lords and gentlemen of Connaught, including the county of Clare, had ſurrendered their eſtates on compoſition to Elizabeth, but had neglected to take out the letters patent for the re-grant of them, as was the cuſtom. This defect was ſupplied by James in his better days, who iſſued new patents for re-conveying their lands to them and their heirs. Theſe patents received the great ſeal, but by neglect of the officers concerned, were not enrolled in chancery, although the proprietors had paid three thouſand pounds for the enrolments.

Advantage was now taken of this involuntary omiſſion. The titles were pronounced defective, and the lands veſted in the crown. Though an act of ſtate, during Lord Grandiſon's government, had declared the titles valid, though the wrong was evident, and the moſt pathetic remonſtrances were made to the King, he would not retract, till the deſperation of a province, inhabited by an active and ſpirited people, became alarming. Influenced by this fear, and his immediate neceſſities, James conſented to ſell a new confirmation of the patents, on conſideration that the rents were to be doubled, and that a fine ſhould be given him equivalent to the ſum that was computed would ariſe from a new plantation of the province. To theſe hard terms the proprietors agreed.

Surely

Surely if to theſe reaſons for diſcontent we add the regret which many of the chieftains or their heirs muſt have retained for their princely prerogatives, and that natural feeling which inſpires one nation to reſiſt the domination of another, a great part of the odium of the ſucceeding rebellion ſhould in juſtice be removed from the ſuppoſed influence of the Catholic religion. Yet there is no doubt that this influence which, as we have ſeen, had but a very partial effect during Elizabeth's reign, took a very decided character at the latter end of James's life.

The point then next to be conſidered, is whether this diſaffection was a neceſſary conſequence of the Catholic religion itſelf, or whether it was excited by the injuries inflicted on thoſe who profeſſed this religion.

The Roman Catholics of the Pale, and of the towns and cities, had fought Elizabeth's battles, and hitherto had conſidered the diſtinction of Engliſh and Iriſh as paramount to that of Proteſtant and Catholic. During the whole of Elizabeth's wars, the Catholics of the Engliſh Pale had always ſided with the Proteſtants of the Engliſh Pale againſt the Iriſh enemy, though Catholics. Yet in return, they had been treated with conſiderable contumely as Catholics, and in conſequence finding their religion made a mark to ſeparate them from the Engliſh Proteſtants, that ſame religion became a common intereſt,

intereſt, which drew them to an union with their ancient enemies, the Catholics of Iriſh race.

On the acceſſion of James, who had been known to have tampered with the court of Rome, they reſumed the public exerciſe of their religion as a thing of courſe; but James, who had meaſures to keep with the puritans, and who was very tenacious of his eccleſiaſtical ſupremacy, prohibited the celebration of the maſs. This was the firſt of thoſe ſad follies which ſacrificed the intereſts of the faireſt iſland in the world to the ſenſeleſs viſions of ſelf-ſufficient bigots. This was the firſt *inſult* which made the moſt important part of the Catholics feel that they had a ſeparate intereſt from the government.

The next ſtep was ſtill more brutal, and proportionably ſtupid. The Catholics were required to attend the Proteſtant churches. Upon their refuſal, the magiſtrates and chief citizens of Dublin were fined and committed to priſon. This ſpread a general feeling of anger among the Catholics, and an immenſe concourſe preſented a remonſtrance againſt the illegality of the impriſonment, as the utmoſt ſeverity of the law, obſolete from the time of its enactment, only authoriſed a fine; and at the ſame time, petitioned for the free exerciſe of their religion.

Unfortunately for that ſyſtem of conciliation, which the vaſt importance, and hitherto known loy-

alty

alty of the Catholics of Engliſh deſcent tended to ſuggeſt to James's counſellors, the news of the Gunpowder Plot was received on the very day this petition was preſented; and though there appeared no reaſon afterwards to ſuppoſe any connection between the Engliſh and Iriſh Catholics, yet this coincidence was productive of every ill effect at the moment. The Iriſh government was alarmed, the chief petitioners were confined in the Caſtle of Dublin, and Sir Patrick Barnwell, their principal agent, was, by the King's command, ſent priſoner into England.

But what contributed more, even than all theſe reaſons, to alienate the minds of the Catholics of the Pale and of the towns, was, their removal from all places of truſt and emolument.

To appreciate the effect which theſe meaſures had upon the minds of the Catholics, we muſt make ourſelves familiar with their ſituation in theſe times, and judge of them from what they were then, not from what they are now. This point is very little underſtood. The Catholics of the Pale and towns had, at the beginning of James's reign, exactly the ſame habitual *aſcendancy* over the mere Iriſh, which the Proteſtants have now over the Catholics. They occupied every ſituation of importance under government, all offices in the law, in the magiſtracy; they filled the ranks and officered the army; they had long been in the habit of conſidering the Engliſh government

government in Ireland as owing its exiſtence to their courage, their loyalty, and not unfrequently to the aſſiſtance of their private fortunes. It had always been conſidered as a matter of courſe that their lords ſhould be conſulted on every important meaſure taken by government. So circumſtanced, the character of the Catholics of thoſe days was quite the reverſe of what it was afterwards. Not habituated to degradation, their ſenſe of honour was lively and reſentful; above ſuſpicion, their conduct was frank, manly, and in juſtification, bordered on defiance; their minds unbroken by adverſity, and unſapped by the effeminacy of ſuperſtition, were liberal, enlarged, rich in the natural luxuriance of talent, and grateful to culture. The hereditary practice of arms had impreſſed upon them the beſt qualities of a ſoldier—moral and phyſical courage, diſintereſtedneſs and promptitude. We ſee in their conduct nothing paltry, wavering, or ſelfiſh.

We are not to imagine that becauſe the Catholics long felt very little intereſt about their emancipation from degradation, that the Catholics then felt very little upon entering on it; on the contrary, juſt that degree of rage and indignation which the Iriſh Proteſtants ſpoiled by power, would now feel, if their churches were ſhut up, if they were compelled to go to maſs, if they were declared incapable of holding any office of truſt and emolument, if they were driven from the privy council; juſt that degree muſt the old Engliſh coloniſts have felt when, for

the

the firſt time, diſcountenanced and perſecuted by the government.

We omit to dwell upon the condemnation of Lalor, a poor popiſh eccleſiaſtic, whom government ſought to dignify with a martyrdom; and upon the expulſion of the popiſh regulars from the kingdom, as far as direct inſults could juſtify the reſentment of the Roman Catholics, we have ſaid enough. An indirect attack was made upon them, more fatal to their intereſts and to thoſe of the country at large, which well merits our conſideration, for we now pay the penalty for it.

James, finding it poſſible that there might be a majority of Roman Catholics in the Houſe of Commons, *created a large number of boroughs* from towns ſo inconſiderable, that they and their repreſentatives would be certain to be dependant on government. Here was accompliſhed the ruin of the Catholics; here was perpetuated the diſtraction of the country; here commenced the corruption of the conſtitution; this meaſure, to which the Proteſtants were baſe acceſſaries, has been viſited upon their deſcendants with poetical juſtice, by the Union, which was effected by purchaſing the corrupt owners of theſe identical rotten boroughs. To this meaſure the Catholics gave all the reſiſtance which ſpirit and talents could prompt. In vain. A tyrant might have yielded from fear; a wiſe king would have retracted

from

from conviction; but the obstinacy and conceit of a pedant were invincible.

Yet James had sense enough to stoop to conciliation when he had carried his point. No new measures were proposed against popery; the oath of supremacy was tacitly excused, and, when a bill was proposed by Sir Oliver St. John for keeping the fifth of November as a religious anniversary, it was silently got rid of.

A government may, with safety to itself, essentially infringe the interests of its subjects, if it has the condescension to manage their pride. This was exemplified in the case of James. Although he had prepared the ruin of the Catholics, yet as soon as he assumed a moderate tone and gentle usage towards them, they vied with the Protestants in expressions of loyalty, and, what was more substantial, in granting subsidies.

Thus stood the question of disaffection when James died: Among the lower ranks, there was a legendary record of English barbarities; the power of the old Irish, and of the old English chieftains, had been destroyed by the wisdom of James; yet, among these septs, there were many who valued the direct gratification of pride, afforded by princely consequence, to the indirect gratification of pride which is acquired through the medium of property: who preferred to be poor tanists, elected by their

clan,

clan, rather than rich landlords dependant on law. The title of Monarch of Ireland was ſtill cheriſhed by the O'Neils, and that it was ſtill allowed, at leaſt by the northern Iriſh, is evident from the great power acquired by Sir Phelim O'Neil, in the great rebellion under Charles I. James's confiſcations, but particularly the attack made on the titles of the province of Connaught, the practice known to be a favourite one with him, even as a ſyſtematical degree, kept men's minds in an uneaſy ſtate of ſuſpenſe for what was to come, and rage for what had paſt.

The perſecution of the Catholics had, for the firſt time, produced a reſiſtance on the part of the old Engliſh Catholics of the Pale, hitherto the moſt efficient ſupporters of the Engliſh power; it had alienated their minds—it had detached their ſympathy from the ancient object of their love, the Engliſh government; and gradually attached it to the ancient object of their deteſtation, the Iriſh enemy. That this was the effect, not of religion, but of the perſecution of the religion, is clear. Had it been the effect of the religion, it would have commenced in Henry VIII.'s time with the Reformation, which it did not; it would have been apparent in Edward VI.'s time, which it was not; it would have proved fatal to the Engliſh power in Elizabeth's wars; yet, at that time, there was little or no apprehenſion of it. But on the contrary, it did not exiſt before the perſecution began; it originated with the perſecution, and it grew and waxed ſtrong, as the perſecution encreaſed.

CHARLES

CHARLES I.

WE now approach a period of Iriſh hiſtory, when increaſed civilization gave a more diſtinct order, and a clearer light to the tranſactions of the times.

The records of theſe days are copious, and are entirely in favour of our argument, and may be relied on with certainty.

We ſhall ſtill purſue the ſame arrangement, pointing out the cauſes which generated rebellion, and diſtinguiſhing the effects produced by the injurious treatment of the profeſſors of the Catholic religion, from the influence of the religion itſelf, until that influence being rouſed and exaſperated by perſecution, acquired a force from its continual ſtruggles, which ſwept before it every obſtacle of prejudice and reaſon, of oppreſſion and law.

Independent of this new influence of religion, which now rapidly encreaſed, we are to conſider, that many previous cauſes of diſcontent continued to exiſt. We are not to omit, the unappeaſed hatred, which the Iriſh ſubjects bore to their Engliſh conquerors. The injuries done to individuals

by confiſcations and plantations, particularly thoſe of Ulſter. The regrets of the deſcendants of the Iriſh chieftains for the loſs of their principalities, and the ever wakeful ambition of the houſe of O'Neil. The more effect theſe cauſes had in producing the ſucceeding rebellion, .the leſs muſt be aſcribed to the Catholic religion.

That theſe cauſes had a principal effect, and produced the rebellion of 1641, though they did not entirely ſupply its force, is very clear, from the following account of its commencement, extracted from Leland:

Roger Moor was the head of that powerful family who had poſſeſſed the dynaſty of Leix, now called the Queen's county. They were his anceſtors, who in the reign of Mary, had been expelled from their princely poſſeſſions, by violence and fraud; the ſept had been almoſt exterminated by military execution. Thoſe that remained, were diſtinguiſhed by an hereditary hatred of the Engliſh. In the progreſs of an obſtinate conteſt, they had re-poſſeſſed themſelves of a great part of the territories, and fought under the O'Moor, of Elizabeth's reign, with great reſolution and perſeverance, but were ultimately defeated, and again driven from their poſſeſſions.

Roger O'Moor poſſeſſed all the qualities of the heroic character, talents, promptitude, courage and love of his country; his perſon was remarkably

graceful,

graceful, has aſpect dignified, his manners courteous. The old Iriſh beheld the gallant repreſentative of one of their kings with an extravagance of rapture and affection, and ſtimulated his ſpirit by the expectations they attached to him. It was a proverbial expreſſion, "our dependence is on God, our Lady, and Roger O'Moor." He was tenderly attached to young O'Neil, the ſon of the great Hugh O'Neil; with him he dwelt on the calamities of their fathers, their brave efforts in the cauſe of their countrymen, and the hopes of ſtill reviving the ancient ſplendor of their families. With ſuch intereſts to confirm his purpoſe, with ſuch paſſions to fire his imagination, is there any neceſſity to ſuppoſe, that religious bigotry was his inducement, to devote himſelf to one brave effort for the independence of his country?

It was upon the ſame feelings he relied, for gaining aſſociates; he ſpoke to the Ulſter Iriſh, of the ſeverities inflicted on them by Elizabeth, and of the plunder of their property by James.

To Mac Guire, whoſe father was chieftain of Fermanagh, he repreſented the ancient power and ſplendor of his family, pathetically lamented his preſent difficulties, and pointed his anger againſt the Engliſh, who had deſpoiled the old and rightful poſſeſſors of the iſland, and planted a race of aliens and foreigners on their property. With the ſame repreſentation he wrought upon Mac Mahon, Reily,

Byrne,* Tyrlogh, and Phelim O'Neil, whoſe anceſtors had, within a no very diſtant date, been poſſeſſed of ſovereign power.

Theſe were the men who planned, theſe the motives that urged and ſtimulated the country to rebellion; whatever acceſſion it afterwards received from different cauſes, theſe muſt be conſidered as the principal, from theſe, and theſe alone, it began; had theſe not exiſted, it is problematical, whether the rebellion itſelf would ever have exiſted.

Another material cauſe of the rebellion, which had no connection with religion, was Lord Stafford's reſumption of the plan for confiſcating the province of Connaught.

The unfortunate landed proprietors had already twice purchaſed their titles from the crown, yet Stafford did not heſitate to outrage every feeling of humanity, and every rule of juſtice, by ſubverting them a third time.

This tranſaction may not perhaps be the moſt infamous that ever occurred, but certainly the moſt infamous act of oppreſſion, that was ever perpetrated by a plea of law, under the ſanction of juries. It is uncomfortable to dwell on ſo abominable an outrage, it is ſufficient to obſerve, that it was in part carried by

* The ſept of the Byrnes had been cruelly haraſſed and ſpoiled by Sir W. Parſons.

by violence, by fining the ſheriffs, impriſoning jurors, and fining them to the amount of 4000l. each, by the terrors of Star Chamber, and the preſence of the Lord Deputy; yet in the end, the haughty and intemperate ſpirit of Stafford was forced to bend to the tempeſt he himſelf had raiſed, and the apprehenſion of a rebellion put a ſtop to the project.

The king deduced his claim from an æra ſo diſtant as the reign of Henry the third, and when we conſider that the attempt had now been thrice repeated, and that upon pretences equally antiquated, the property of the O'Byrnes, in Wicklow, had lately been confiſcated; we muſt not be ſurpriſed, that none of the Iriſh, or old Engliſh, felt ſecure in their poſſeſſions.

Let us now conſider, how far religion may be conſidered as a cauſe of the rebellion.

We have already ſeen that in James's reign the Catholic religion had aſſumed a very decided influence on men's minds; in Charles's reign, this continued to encreaſe; in both reigns it was adverſe to the government. In James's reign, we proved, that this aroſe from the injuries ſuſtained by the profeſſors of that faith, not from the faith itſelf; let us ſee if there are any grounds to ſupport the ſame concluſion during the reign of Charles.

The

The firſt important injuſtice which tended to alienate the minds of the Roman Catholics, was the perfidy of Charles, with regard to the celebrated Graces. The Catholics* had offered to pay one hundred and twenty thouſand pounds for the enactment of certain laws, for the ſecurity of toleration, property, and juſtice; the king accepted their offer, and gave his royal promiſe, that theſe laws ſhould be paſſed. He took their money, and broke his word in the moſt cruel and inſulting manner; and not one of theſe Graces, though they were ſo reaſonable and wiſe, that the monarch ought to have been obliged to the ſubject for ſuggeſting them, was ever granted.

Thus, in addition to the indignation which the Catholics already felt, on account of the penal laws, was added, reſentment for the loſs of their money, and that bitter vexation, which is always felt by perſons conſcious of having been duped.

The Catholics felt this treatment more ſenſibly, becauſe, from the ſuppoſed partiality of Charles, to the Popiſh religion, they had expected protection, countenance, and favour.

Charles, with that policy, at the ſame time ungenerous and fruitleſs, which is ever the reſource of tottering power, ſacrificed his friends, in hopes of appeaſing

* Part of the money was alſo paid by Proteſtants, as ſeveral of the Graces were of a general nature.

appeaſing his enemies. The new Engliſh and the Puritans in Ireland, were courted and advanced to every office of truſt, while the old Engliſh, (moſtly Catholics,) who had been in the habit of influencing every affair of moment, were driven from the court with every expreſſion of contumely and contempt. The invidious fine on Catholics, for not frequenting church on Sundays, was perpetually threatened to be impoſed, and at length was made a ſource of revenue, and was commuted by Lord Stafford, for the ſum of 20,000l. Finally, Sir William Parſons was appointed Lord Chief Juſtice, and the Catholics could no longer entertain any doubt, but that the Puritans would acquire the ſame aſcendancy in Ireland, which they had already done in England.

To calculate the impreſſion which this conviction muſt have produced on the minds of Catholics, we ought to look back to the language held by the Puritans of thoſe days, and the ſentiments they avowed, when ſpeaking of the Catholics; the inſolence of political ſuperiority intoxicated them, the pride of fanaticiſm hardened their hearts; their power was commenſurate with their hate; with one hand they ſigned the law, with the other they raiſed the ſword that was to exterminate the Papiſts, whom they called bloody.

All this time, while the Engliſh government prepared the ground, the court of Rome was induſtriouſly ſowing the ſeeds of rebellion.

Jeſuits

Jeſuits and prieſts were ſent from Spain and Rome, who knew how to turn theſe prepoſterous miſtakes of government, to the beſt account; they knew how to enflame men's paſſions by their pride, how to mould their opinions by their intereſts, and how to urge religion to fanaticiſm, by the ſharp incentive of injuries and inſults. Hence the Catholic religion, which in Ireland had till now been characteriſed by a native mildneſs, a ſpirit of toleration, and a compoſure peculiar to old eſtabliſhments, acquired an illiberal, enthuſiaſtic, and ſanguinary ſpirit.

Yet, ſo difficult is it even for oppreſſion to eradicate from men's minds, the habits of loyalty and ſubmiſſion to government, that the religious principle appears to have had little influence in originating the rebellion. Even when the ſtronger feelings of injured intereſt, and outraged pride, had urged the native Iriſh to take up arms, the Catholics of the Pale advanced forward in ſupport of government. They were received with a ſevere ſuſpicion, by the puritan chief juſtice; and inſtead of being as of old, looked up to as the ſolid ſupport of government, (which probably would have made them continue ſo) a very ſcanty ſupply of arms was delivered to them. At length, on the progreſs of the rebellion, they were entirely deprived of arms.

This was the full meaſure of folly, and completed that ſeries of inſults and injuries, which broke

broke the ſtrong bands of habitual loyalty which had hitherto attached the Catholics of the Pale to the Engliſh government, with a fidelity that had never been ſuſpected through five ſucceſſive reigns.

The Catholic lords and gentlemen of the Pale, when their loyalty was made incompatible with their honour, reluctantly had recourſe to reſiſtance, and ſooner than ſurrender their arms, turned them againſt the government.*

The Catholics of the Pale, hitherto the moſt determined enemies of the native Iriſh, now joined in their rebellion.

This is the event with which the train of our argument cloſes.

Before this it is impoſſible to call the rebellions of the Iriſh, Catholic rebellions, when they were in fact principally oppoſed by Catholics; but after this it would be idle to deny that Catholic bigotry had a very large ſhare in exciting and prolonging the rebellions

* In an age when the profeſſion of arms was the only profeſſion of a gentleman, and when it was diſgraceful to appear without them, this meaſure of depriving the Catholic gentry of arms, muſt have been felt as a much greater inſult, than what we have now any idea of.

rebellions in Ireland. That writer would be an injudicious defender of the Catholics, who ſhould deny the fact; when perhaps there is not a more lamentable inſtance of the weakneſs of the human mind, when ſubſervient to religious bigotry, than the abſurdity and intemperance with which the Catholics acted, when they ſurrendered their intereſts to the influence of the Nuncio Ranuncini, and in fact ſold their country to the Pope.

But if it is certain that the Catholics became bigots and rebels, it is no leſs certain that their bigotry and rebellions aroſe entirely from the injuries and inſults inflicted on them; and if we have made this clear ſo far, it is unneceſſary to carry the argument further, as this perſecution was *encreaſed* to a degree which future ages will ſcarcely believe, or believing, will wonder how it could be borne.

To the Proteſtants theſe arguments are addreſſed, and if they have no other effect than to make them re-conſider the *policy* of maintaining the preſent political inferiority of the Catholics, they will not have been urged in vain.

In our anxiety to produce conviction, we have already been guilty of too much repetition. Inſtead, therefore, of recapitulating our arguments, we will take a ſhort view of the impolicy of continuing the preſent reſtrictions, and briefly ſtate their practical effect.

We

We will not argue the queſtion of right. In this age of mere mercantile feelings, to ſpeak from the heart, is not to ſpeak to the head; we muſt prove the Catholic reſtrictions to be a loſing ſpeculation, or we prove nothing.

At this preſent moment, the whole ſoul of England is bent on reducing the power of the French within reaſonable bounds. For this they are profuſe of their blood, and their very means of ſubſiſtence; yet to this they will not ſacrifice their bigotry. If England had poſſeſſed any day theſe laſt three months, a diſpoſable army of 60,000 men, to act on the Continent, ſhe might have ſtruck a deciſive blow; ſhe might have deſtroyed Boulogne, ſhe might eaſily have become miſtreſs of Italy, or ſhe might have hung upon the whole line of French dominion, and held thoſe armies in ſuſpenſe, which now pour into Poland with ſuch uninterrupted celerity. Yet double this force might have been raiſed in Ireland, if the minds of its inhabitants had been conciliated by a conſtitutional grant of civil and religious freedom.

At preſent, the Roman Catholic peaſantry enliſt with the greateſt reluctance, becauſe government ſets their religious faith, and their military duty, at variance, and the circumſtance of there being no Catholic officers in the army, deſtroys that inclination

tion to enliſt, which always ariſes from ſerving under officers of the ſame ſect as themſelves.

The ſame injudicious intolerance makes the peaſantry diſaffected; what follows? you cannot truſt in the militia, for they are Catholics. The yeomanry are too few in numbers; and as they, from the ſame infection of intolerance, are partizans, in calling in their aid, you run the riſk of exciting a civil war.

You are forced then, in order to prevent the bad effects of your ſyſtem of government, to bring an army from England. Then comes the fear of invaſion, and your difficulties multiply an hundred fold. You want an additional army to keep down the peaſantry, you want an army to awe the militia, you want an army to reſtrain the intemperate zeal of the yeomanry, you want an army to oppoſe the enemy.

This is no very inaccurate ſtatement of the military neceſſities of the Engliſh government in Ireland, which ariſe entirely from the want of wiſdom in their political meaſures. An army without any facility of recruiting; a people for your enemy; a militia that you place no confidence in; a yeomanry whoſe very aſſiſtance is accompanied with the riſk of injuring you; and a foreign enemy, ready to take the firſt opportunity of turning your miſtakes to his own profit.

But

But for a moment reverſe your meaſures: treat the Proteſtants and Catholics without any diſcrimination, aſſuage the wounded pride of the country, by ſome modification of the union, and the hearts of the Iriſh, naturally loyal and affectionate, will yield with delight to the ſentiments of zeal and duty towards the government.

Who, that ſympathiſed in the expanſion of honeſt gratulation which broke forth on the Duke of Bedford's arrival in Ireland, can doubt it!

What would be the effect? The yeomanry, ſtrengthened by the acceſſion of all the wealthy and more reſpectable Catholics, and without any apprehenſion of internal inſurrection, would be quite ſufficient to defend the country from any ſudden invaſion, on a ſmall ſcale. The militia might be ſent on foreign ſervice, together with the Engliſh army, at preſent locked up in Ireland, or kept in England from the apprehenſion of danger in Ireland.

The recruiting ſervice, aſſiſted with the influence of Catholic officers, would go on with rapidity, and produce an annual ſupply, far beyond what is imagined. By theſe means, an army of at leaſt 60,000 men might be made diſpoſable, and be brought to act againſt the moſt vulnerable parts of the French empire: let its loſſes be ever ſo great, the means of recruiting it would be nearly ixexhauſtible; and it is no great preſumption, after what we have ſeen done

by

by a combined army of Iriſh and Engliſh at Egypt, and at Maida, to ſay, that it would conſiſt of the braveſt, and moſt formidable troops in Europe.

To this deſirable and deciſive increaſe in national ſtrength, there is but the one obſtacle, a kind of nurſery terror of the Pope, which ſtill clings to our maturer reaſon.

It is by the extreme of this terror that our oppo-nents are blinded, or they would perceive that we have the ſame object in view with them, only that we purſue it by very different means.

They wiſh to ſecure the forfeited properties to their preſent owners; ſo do we. They wiſh to put an end to Catholic rebellions; ſo do we. They wiſh to curb the bigotry and intolerance of the Ca-tholic religion; ſo do we. What means have they adopted to effect this purpoſe, and have they ſuc-ceeded? No. Why then ſhould you be ſo averſe to try an oppoſite mode of proceeding?

You were poſſeſſed of every inſtrument of influ-ence, of reſtriction, of terror, and you made ample uſe of them; yet the Roman Catholics, like the Iſraelites of old, multiplied under the oppreſſion of their taſk-maſters. If intereſt has failed to gain one ſingle convert from the moſt corrupt of the Ro-man Catholics, the deſire of political importance from the moſt ambitious, fear from the moſt timid, cer-

tainly

tainly the ſevere and diſqualifying ſyſtem is radically wrong. On the contrary, it has become a received axiom in modern policy, that ſects force gain and numbers by being ſtigmatized and oppreſſed, but by being aſſimilated and adopted by government, their union is relaxed, and their numbers diminiſhed. Voltaire was a deiſt, his teſtimony muſt, therefore, be conſidered as impartial; Mrs. Barbauld is a diſſenter, her evidence is the confeſſion of an enemy.* Both agree that ſects only flouriſh from the diſtinctive marks and diſqualifications which governments attach to them, becauſe no honourable man would quit a diſcountenanced ſect, as his deſertion would not be ſuppoſed to ariſe from a change of opinion, but from motives of fear or mean intereſtedneſs. But when nothing is loſt by remaining attached to a ſect, and nothing gained by quitting it, its adherents will liſten to perſuaſion, or will yield to faſhion, and will naturally adopt that form of religion which is moſt conſonant to truth, or moſt ſuitable to the manners of the world.

In this age when ſcepticiſm is affected as a mark of talents, and religious policy enters very little into the

* See Voltaire's Engliſh letters. Mrs. Barbauld's beautiful Eſſay on Devotional Taſte.

"That converſion will always be ſuſpected which apparently concurs with intereſt; he that never finds his error till it hinders his progreſs towards wealth and honour, will not be thought to love truth only for herſelf." Johnſon on Dryden's Converſion.

the uſual intercourſe of the world, even the Proteſtant religion, diveſted of many awkward articles of faith, and of all the rigour of church diſcipline, is lamentably on the decline. We cannot ſuppoſe that the doctrines and ceremonies of the Catholic religion are more conſonant with reaſon, or more agreeable to the ſtrong impulſe of manners; ſurely, then, its flouriſhing ſtate muſt be the effect of the political cauſes to which it is ſubjected; of that irritation which prevents indifference; of thoſe diſtinctions which make adherence amenable to public opinion; of thoſe privations which make apoſtacy baſe.

The preſent union and formidable dimenſion of the Catholic body, ariſe from the injudicious repulſion of government; as a political party, they could never hold together merely by their own weak attraction.

What can be a ſtronger proof of the truth of this reaſoning, than the fluctuation of religious zeal in France? The Roman Catholic religion had there been long eſtabliſhed under the monarchy, and had gradually dwindled into a mere ſtate ceremonial. Perſecuted, during the violence of the revolution, it recovered the enthuſiaſm of primitive Chriſtianity; tolerated under the conſulate, its zeal abated. Once more eſtabliſhed under the imperial houſe, it has ceaſed to be an object of intereſt, and the churches are once more abandoned.*

It

* See Maclean's Tour in France.

It is not from the efforts of the eſtabliſhed church, from its charter-ſchools, and the aid of penal laws, that the Catholics have any reaſon to apprehend a diminution of numbers, but from a *ſect*, and that ſect the Methodiſts. A very obvious fact will ſometimes remain unnoticed, and yet when once pointed out, will be generally acknowledged. This we imagine to be the caſe with the hitherto unnoticed progreſs the Methodiſts are making in Ireland againſt the Roman Catholic religion. Their eloquence, their zeal, and aſtoniſhing induſtry in employing the moſt minute means to propagate their tenets; above all the judicious uſe they make of the power of the preſs, has produced an impreſſion which has evidently alarmed the Catholic prieſthood. We are very doubtful whether it is an event to be wiſhed: whether the Catholic religion is not better adapted to the cheerful temper of the Iriſh peaſantry, than the proud and ſullen ſpirit of Methodiſm; yet we have not the leaſt doubt, that if the Catholic clergy were paid by government, and if the practice and principle of religious reſtrictions were abandoned, in the courſe of a few years, a very large portion of the Iriſh peaſantry would be converted to Methodiſm.

At preſent, the Methodiſts only ſucceed in cutting off ſupplies from the eſtabliſhed church, and have reduced it to an inſignificance, which, compared with its revenues, is quite ridiculous.

What then, in the name of conſiſtency, can make the enemies of Popery ſo violent in their oppoſition

to the only meaſures which can check the influence of the Catholic religion? That which will ever make the opinion of the multitude an abſurd one, on abſtruſe ſubjects; the want of capacity and incli-nation to examine farther than the *apparent* effects of circumſtances; which makes them believe, that ſcarcity is the effect of regrators and monopoliſts; that protecting duties bring home-manufactories to perfection; that the ſun revolves round the earth, or any error which it requires a *chain* of reaſoning to refute.

But whence can ariſe the oppoſition of government to the emancipation of the Catholics? are we ſeriouſly to be referred to his Majeſty's coronation oath, to his Majeſty's ſcruples of conſcience!

There is at leaſt as much truth in the maxim that the King never dies, as that the King can do no wrong; and if the former means any thing, it is that the conſtitution ſolely regards the King in a political, never in a perſonal light: his life is a political life, and knows no diſſolution; his acts are conſidered only as acts of ſtate, for which not the King, but miniſters are reſponſible: his oath is not his own perſonally, he is not reſponſible even for its violation, but his miniſters are; it is an act of ſtate, it is a pledge given to the legiſlature; the performance of which they only can exact, they only can remit, and which an act of theirs clearly *can* remit.

There has been of late years, a great, an alarming, and a treaſonable inroad made upon the conſti-

tution,

tution, by a ſet of men, who perpetually introduce the idea of the King's perſonality; of which the wiſdom of our conſtitution has foreſeen the danger, and has guarded againſt it with the moſt anxious care. For, if that fatal hour ſhall ever come when the King of England ſhall be the leader of a party—when he ſhall be nominally King, and virtually miniſter—when to the prerogative of the veto, he ſhall add the power of the initiative—that ſacred fiction, that the King can do no wrong, will gradually diſappear before the force of imperious circumſtances, and reſponſibility will gradually attach itſelf to the idea and the perſon of the King.

This revolution we believe to be far, very far diſtant; nor are we of that claſs of alarmiſts who inſtantly believe the exiſtence of whatever they apprehend. But foreſeeing the calamities that would flow from ſuch a change, we cannot think ourſelves too anxious in proteſting againſt the too frequent introduction of the idea of the King's private feelings and interference on great political queſtions.

We ſhall, therefore, with more decency, and more in the ſpirit of the conſtitution, conſider only the ſcruples of conſcience which may ariſe in the breaſts of his Majeſty's miniſters, or the two houſes of Parliament, from any inconſiſtency between the coronation oath, and the repeal of the reſtrictions on the Roman Catholics.

There appears nothing in the literal ſenſe of the oath hoſtile to the removal of any religious diſqualifications impoſed upon any ſect, when ſuch diſqualifications are found to be detrimental to the empire. But as words may be conſtrued into almoſt any meaning, we will not ſtand upon theſe grounds; but ſuppoſe that Catholic emancipation is inconſiſtent with the tenor of the coronation oath.

We will now aſk, can any obligation, any oath be valid in the eye of religion and morality, which is grounded on a violation of an engagement more ſolemn and ſacred? There can be no doubt of the reply: Certainly not.

Then we aſk, how can the government plead the coronation oath to perpetuate meaſures that were enacted in violation of the ſolemn treaty of Limerick?

That treaty remains a monument of the moſt flagrant perfidy that ever diſgraced a nation; upon the faith of it, the Iriſh Catholics gave up that power and influence, which you neither will, nor can reſtore to them. And till that treaty is fulfilled in its moſt liberal ſenſe, no ingenuity can remove the ſtain of deliberate perjury from the character of the Engliſh nation.

Surely it is a conſcience which will ſtrain at gnats, and yet ſwallow camels, which ſtickles for an oath of ceremony, doubtful even in the meaning of the

animus

animus imponentis; and yet will be content to violate a compact ſo important as the treaty of Limerick, for which you have received your conſideration, and on which millions reſted their confidence and their intereſts.

Surely the conſcience of miniſters might be affected by the violation of thoſe pledges given to the Catholics at the time of the Union, (it ſignifies not whether expreſſed or implied;) ſurely they might feel compunction at betraying a nation to diſhonour, and then with-holding from her the paltry recompenſe that bribed her to her diſgrace.

The men who perpetuate a crime, commit it; and as long as the preſent or any miniſtry continue the reſtrictions on the Iriſh Roman Catholics, they are deeply reſponſible for a groſs and diſhonourable breach of common faith and honeſty. It is in vain they attempt to ſhelter themſelves under the plea of the King's perſonal feelings. It will not be readily ſuppoſed that his Majeſty, whoſe principal glory will hereafter reſt on the repeal he has made of the ſeverer penal ſtatutes in Ireland, who has ſeen the happieſt effects, in promoting wealth, and the ſecurity of property, flow from that repeal, it will not be readily ſuppoſed that he can be actuated by the illiberal ſpirit which his ſelf-named friends, but real enemies, charge to his account.*

Though

* His preſent Majeſty repealed the Act of Parliament, by which Iriſh Catholics were prevented from purchaſing property.

Though we are not inclined in general to violent meaſures, yet we think that impeachment and impriſonment in the Tower, would be too gentle a puniſhment for thoſe ſecret adviſers, who have not only unhinged the moſt delicate ſprings of the conſtitution to ſerve their private views, but have done their beſt to caſt obloquy and contempt on the name of the King—a name which ought never to be compromiſed on any topic whatever—ought never to be expoſed to the common handling of public diſquiſition.

With what flagrant and impudent miſrepreſentations muſt theſe men have poiſoned the King's ear, if they have ſucceeded in making him perverſely hoſtile to the Iriſh Roman Catholics—a body of men who have the ſtrongeſt devotion and attachment not only to his Majeſty's political, but to his perſonal character, and who would ſet a value on his Majeſty's countenance and favour, only inferior to that which they would attach to the benignity of their God.*

We

perty. The ſame alarm was felt at that repeal, which is now attempted to be raiſed on account of a ſtill more liberal repeal; and yet none but the beſt conſequences have followed. The large purchaſes which the Catholics have made of the forfeited lands, have removed the inſecurity which depreſſed their value, as long as they were poſſeſſed excluſively by Proteſtants.

* We have heard Iriſh Catholics, who have had only a glimpſe of his Majeſty's perſon on Windſor terrace, ſpeak of him with

We are anxious before we conclude, to give the public the means to form a juſt eſtimate of the hardſhip of the privations which the Iriſh Catholics experience, the extent of which is not generally underſtood, and from the ſuppoſed inſignificance of which, an argument is ſometimes drawn againſt their repeal.

The Catholics, by being excluded from all offices of truſt and emolument, loſe all political conſequence in the country; ſo that a Proteſtant of ſeven hundred a year is more looked up to than a Catholic of ſeven thouſand a year.

By being excluded from ſitting in Parliament, they are deprived of the moſt precious and moſt effective guarantee of civil liberty.

This diſqualification, in fact, ſhuts them out from the ſubordinate offices which the law permits them to hold; for all theſe are places more or leſs at the diſpoſal of the Iriſh members of Parliament, in order to ſecure their attachment to miniſters.

Thus Catholics, through the greater part of Ireland, are ſtill virtually excluded from the offices of Juſtice of Peace, and Grand Juror; and where they are admitted, it is becauſe they have a ſufficient number

with a fervor and delight, which we never witneſſed in an Iriſh Proteſtant, who only loves his King, as a Dublin coal merchant does a foul wind, becauſe it encreaſes his monopoly.

number of votes to be an object to the county member.

A gentleman's conſequence in Ireland conſiſts very much at preſent in being a Juſtice of the Peace, a Grand Juror, and a Captain of a yeoman corps. From theſe ſituations the Catholics are, for the moſt part, in fact excluded, and conſequently exiſt in a very painful degree of inſignificance.

From the ſame cauſe the middling claſs of Roman Catholics are excluded from the very deſirable employments of the revenue, the exciſe, and all petty municipal offices. So complete is the monopoly of civil employments in Ireland, that to be a Proteſtant is almoſt ſufficient to be ſecure of a competence.

But the Catholics may have recourſe to trade. It is true; but under great comparative diſadvantages. They are excluded from all corporations, and are debarred by law from being Directors of the Bank.

It is very plain that this oppreſſive reſtriction, ſubverſive of the freedom of trade as well as of civil liberty, muſt have a very pernicious effect on the induſtry of the Catholics; and if Catholic tradeſmen and artizans ſhould be found more addicted to idle and irregular habits than the Proteſtants, it may fairly be aſcribed to this very intelligible cauſe, rather than to the nature of their religion.

Another

Another immediate injury, which the preſent penal ſtatutes inflict on the Catholics, is a great inſecurity of property and perſon, and extreme uncertainty of redreſs from the laws of their country.

Catholics cannot be Sheriffs, or Sub-ſheriffs; Juries are of courſe Proteſtant; and on any trial, where party feelings can interfere, a Catholic is generally judged unfairly.

It is grown into a proverb among the common people in Ireland, that there is no law for a Catholic.

But a ſtill more vexatious train of injuries flow from the influence which theſe penal ſtatutes have in forming habits and opinions inimical to the Catholics.

Government in fact, is the great leader of the ton, and its caprices and abſurdities are adopted by the public, with all the rage and ſervility of faſhion.

The Engliſh government manifeſt by their tenaciouſneſs of the penal laws, that they miſtruſt and diſlike the Catholics.

Firſt come the Bank Directors of Ireland, who, not having the good ſenſe to feel, that as their profeſſion is naturally ſordid and ſelfiſh, it ought to be counteracted by liberality of ſentiment, paſs a law,

that

that no Catholic ſhall be employed in any office belonging to the Bank, the number of which is very conſiderable.

Proteſtant families will not in general take Catholic ſervants: every newſpaper contains advertiſements for ſervants; ſignifying, that they muſt not be Catholics.

In yeoman corps, with very few exceptions, no Catholics are admitted.

Upon the laſt rebellion, the principal Roman Catholics in Dublin, were anxious to enrol themſelves in yeoman corps; they were rejected to a man, by the merchant's corps, and in general by all others, and were only admitted into the lawyer's corps.

In the country corps of yeomanry, the bigotry of the captains generally excludes Catholics, and even when the captains would wiſh, for the appearance of their corps, to mix a few ſtout comely Catholics in it, the bigotry of the privates interferes to prevent it; as in moſt inſtances, they would reſign to a man, if ſuch a meaſure was perſiſted in.

In many towns of Ireland, there are convivial ſocieties, among whom it is a rule to exclude all Catholics.

In

In many counties, Proteſtants will not viſit a Catholic, and it is the faſhion to ſpeak of them in the moſt injurious and degrading terms.

Yet the Iriſh Proteſtants are not ſo much to be blamed for theſe ridiculous and diſgraceful habits of domeſtic diſſenſion; they ſuffered in fact much by a rebellion which they imagined ſprung from Catholic bigotry. They ſuffered ſtill more in apprehenſion.

They were too much under the influence of alarm to enquire calmly into the cauſes of the inſurrection, or to conſider that a popular commotion, excited by contumely, could not be appeaſed by a continuance of injurious uſage.

But the Britiſh cabinet, ſafe and at a diſtance, cannot reaſonably urge the danger of the preſent moment, as an excuſe for continuing a ſyſtem of inſult towards the Catholics, blind to all its future conſequences.

We may diſapprove, yet we may ſtill view with ſome ſcruples of allowance, the inſtitution of Orange Lodges, thoſe great political blunders of thoſe Proteſtant gentry. But the government cannot be excuſed for countenancing the public celebration of the 1ſt and 12th of July, and the 4th of November; which every year give riſe to the moſt fatal outrages on the part of the Proteſtants; which are notoriouſly intended

intended by the one party, and felt by the other, as a parade of inſulting domination.

It requires no great ſpirit of prophecy to foretel, that if the Engliſh cabinet go on preparing every year, more materials for a civil war in Ireland, the public celebration of one of thoſe days, will afford the trifling cauſe, the little ſpark, which is ever wanting to make the train of miſchief explode.*

Will the Engliſh cabinet never perceive the important circumſtances on which all political events are now turning?

Will they not open their eyes to that incalculable encreaſe of perſonal pride, which has taken place in the Britiſh iſlands?

Can they not ſee that every effort of modern habits, is directed to the gratification of pride and vanity; and to ſecure, under ſome ſhape or other, the eſteem and regard of ſociety?

Will they never abandon thoſe Scotch principles of policy, which only regard the vulgar intereſts of men, and neglect the feelings of the human mind, to which the ſtrongeſt intereſt is after all entirely ſubſervient?

Of

* The Duke of Bedford, with that good ſenſe, which if permitted, would have achieved the preſervation of Ireland, forebore to countenance the celebration of the Orange Orgies, by his preſence.

Of what value is wealth, and all the principles of economy on which it is ſupported, but as it aſſiſts the gratification of perſonal pride?

What kind of policy then is this, which would ſcruple to plunder the Roman Catholics of their wealth, which is of no value, but as a means to gratify their perſonal pride, and yet will not heſitate to make a direct attack on that perſonal pride in its moſt delicate and moſt irritable organs?

If there is a political maxim eſtabliſhed by experience, it is, that it is ſafer to injure men in their intereſts, than to wound their pride.

The moſt diſagreeable circumſtances which the Catholics are expoſed to, are theſe teſtimonies of contempt inflicted on them by their fellow-countrymen, which would not take place, did not the government of the country declare the Catholics to have forfeited its ſympathy, and to be unworthy of its confidence.

You may ſay, that this want of confidence is merely nominal; that government in fact, places as much confidence in Catholic ſoldiers and ſailors, as in Proteſtants.

Allow, (which is not the caſe,) that this want of confidence is merely nominal, ſtill when a government calls names, whether good or bad, they become in fact, very grave realities.

Government

Government calls a man a lord. This is only a name; but do not the moſt ſubſtantial effects of conſequence and ſuperiority flow from it?

But the reverſe of any propoſition that is true, is true alſo in the reverſe; and if government, by attaching nominal honours to men, really inveſts them with ſuperiority and grandeur; ſo by attaching nominal diſhonours to men, it ſtamps upon them inferiority and diſgrace.

It is not, therefore, for the ſake of political emoluments alone, (though theſe are fair objects of honorable ambition) it is not merely to repreſent the inſignificance of their country in Parliament, that the Catholics look for an equality with the Proteſtants; this is not the emancipation which informs them with one ſoul, one intereſt, one purpoſe; what they may not, what they will not forego, is an emancipation from national contempt, from public ignominy, from domeſtic depredation.

A Catholic ſuffers the three moſt poignant feelings, that can touch the human heart.

The government of his country paſſes a vote of cenſure on him.

His fellow-citizen expreſſes his contempt for him, and expreſſes it with impunity.

The

The child of his affection bluſhes for him, and mourns for himſelf, when he learns that he neceſſarily inherits from his father a blot and a reproach, which no private virtues, or mental endowments, can obliterate or conceal.

How can we torture with this refined barbarity?

Do not we ſhrink back at the ſight of a limb being cut off, and feel it in our own marrow? Can we not feel, becauſe the ſufferer is a Catholic?

O hearts of barbarians, of zealots, of Proteſtants! the flames which made the name of Bonner accurſed, the hideous night of St. Bartholomew, are not ſo great a diſgrace to the character of man, as your cold contriving bigotry.

They at leaſt had the excuſe, the varniſh of religious feeling; they ſprung not from ſelfiſhneſs, but from a viſitation of fanaticiſm, as inſcrutable as phyſical inſanity. Theſe men merely made a miſtake; they worſhipped a demon, and thought him God.

But you, with perfect poſſeſſion of your faculties, with a calm pulſe, and minds unaffected by the ſlighteſt emotion, perpetuate ſtatutes, to gall the beſt and moſt honourable feelings of many millions of men, whoſe ſenſations of pleaſure and pain are exactly of the ſame nature with thoſe from which your own happineſs or miſery is derived.

The

The Catholics can feel, and do ſuffer.

The very peaſantry acutely feel the ſtigma caſt by government upon their ſect and their religion. The loweſt order even ſuffer moſt. The wealthy Catholics acquire a degree of conſideration and legal ſecurity from their property, but the peaſantry are left naked to the pelting of the ſtorm, to all the jibes and jobs of Proteſtant aſcendancy.

Not only a Proteſtant lord looks down upon a Catholic lord, and a Proteſtant gentleman on a Catholic gentleman, but a Proteſtant peaſant on a Catholic peaſant; and in proportion as the degrading ſcale deſcends, the expreſſion of contempt becomes more marked and groſs.

Now, let any man ſay, can ſuch diſqualifications be perpetuated with juſtice or humanity; or can they be borne with patience?

Can we then find too ſtrong terms to expoſe to Europe, every where elſe enlightened and liberal, the dull and malignant conduct of the Iriſh and Engliſh Proteſtants?

Can we find words to expreſs our aſtoniſhment, that the Engliſh cabinet ſhould become an echo, not to ravings of Bedlam, but to a cento of every thing that is groſs, vulgar, and perverſe; Dublin guilds, common council-men, aldermen, corporations; fat fools, that have been hitherto non-de-

ſcripts

ſcripts in the claſſes of ſcience, literature, and good ſenſe.

Can we too warmly deprecate the diſingenuouſneſs with which every variety of rebellion in Ireland is attributed to the Catholic religion, without ever taking into conſideration, the injuſtice with which the profeſſors of that religion have been treated?

The Proteſtants, in their terror of perſecution, have become perſecutors; their alarm at Catholic atrocities, has made them atrocious; to hear them ſpeak, one would imagine that they had been the patient and uncomplaining ſufferers, from the reign of William till George the Third; that they had borne this long and cruel teſt of loyal reſignation; that they had been deprived of property, of arms, of every legal and honourable right.

No, it is not ſuffering, but it is power, it is the pride of artificial aſcendancy, it is the jealouſy ariſing from excluſive privilege, that corrupts the underſtanding, and hardens the heart.

The ridicule of this outcry, which the Proteſtants make againſt the Catholics, at the very time they oppreſs them; and indeed our whole train of argument, cannot be better illuſtrated, than by an old fable and moral, which we make no apology for delivering in the very words of Sir R. L'Eſtrange:

FABLE OF A WOLF AND LAMB.

" AS a Wolf was lapping at the *head* of a fountain, he ſpied a Lamb paddling at the ſame time, a good way off *down* the ſtream. The Wolf had no ſooner the prey in his eye, but away he runs open mouthed to it. " Villain, ſays he, how dare you lie muddling the water that I am drinking?

" Indeed, ſays the poor Lamb, I did not think that my drinking here *below*, could have fouled your water ſo far above.

" Nay, ſays the other, you will never leave your chopping of logic, till your ſkin's turned over your ears, as your father's was a matter of ſix months ago, for prating at this ſaucy rate. You remember it full well ſirrah.

" If you will believe me, Sir, quoth the innocent lamb, with fear and trembling, I was not come into the world then.

" Why, how now then, Impudence, cries the Wolf, haſt thou neither ſhame nor conſcience? *but it runs in the blood of your whole race, ſirrah, to hate our family*, and therefore, ſince fortune has brought us together ſo conveniently, you ſhall e'en pay ſome of your fore-fathers ſcores, before you and I part; ſo without any more ado, he leapt at the throat of the miſerable helpleſs lamb, and tore him to pieces."

MORAL.

MORAL.

" PRIDE and cruelty never want a pretence to oppreſs; the plea of not guilty goes for nothing againſt power; for accuſing is proving, where malice and force are joined in the proſecution.

" When innocence is to be oppreſſed by might, arguments are fooliſh things; nay, the very merits of the perſon accuſed, are improved to his condemnation. The Lamb itſelf ſhall be made malicious.

" And what is this now, but the lively image of a perverſe reaſon of ſtate, ſet up in oppoſition to truth and juſtice, but under the auguſt name and pretence of both. As loyalty, for the purpoſe, ſhall be called rebellion; decency of religious worſhip ſhall be made ſuperſtition; tenderneſs of conſcience ſhall be called fanaticiſm, ſingularity and faction.

" The cauſe of the innocent muſt be remitted at laſt to that great and final deciſion, where there is no place for paſſion, partiality, or error. But as to the buſineſs of this world, when Lambs are the accuſed, and Wolves the judges, the injured muſt expect no better quarter; eſpecially when the heart's blood of the one is the nouriſhment and entertainment of the other."

FINIS.

AGRICULTURAL BOOKS,

SOLD BY

J. HARDING, No. 36, St. JAMES'S STREET.

SYSTEMS OF AGRICULTURE.

Banister's Synopsis of Husbandry, 8vo. 8*s*.
Carpenter's Treatise on Agriculture, 2 v. 8vo. 1*l*. 1*s*.
Dickson's System of Modern Husbandry, including Planting, the Management of Stock, &c. &c. 2 v. 4to. Plates, 4*l*. 4*s*.
Donaldson's Modern Agriculture, and present State of Husbandry in Great Britain, 4 v. 8vo. 1*l*. 16*s*.
Forbes's Practice of the New Husbandry, 8vo. 5*s*.
Forsyth's Principles and Practice of Modern Agriculture, 2 v. 8vo. 1*l*. 1*s*.
Malcolm's Compendium of Modern Husbandry, 3 v. 1*l*. 16*s*.
Parkinson's Experienced Farmer; a complete System of Husbandry, a new edition, enlarged, 2 v. 8vo.
Parkinson's English Husbandry exemplified by practice in Ireland, with Plates, 8vo. 9*s*.
Young's Farmer's Calendar, showing the business necessary to be performed on different kinds of Farms, every month in the year, 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.
Lawrence's New Farmer's Calendar, 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.
Dickson's Complete Farmer, 2 v. 4to. with Plates, &c.

CULTIVATION OF THE EARTH.

Alderson's Essay on the means of improving poor Soils, where Lime and Manure are not to be had, 2*s*.
Aiton on the Cultivation of Peat Earth, 3*s*. 6*d*.
Anderson on Peat Moss, its nature and use, 5*s*.
——— on Draining Swampy Lands, &c. &c. with plates, 6*s*.
Elkington's System of Draining Lands, with plates, 6*s*.
Dugdale on Draining Fens and Morasses, Embanking, &c. folio, with plates, 2*l*. 2*s*.
Turbilly on the Cultivation of Waste and Barren Land, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Turner on Draining Peat Bogs, 3*s*.
Banks (Sir Joseph) on the Diseases of Corn; with Experiments and Observations on the cause of Blight and other matters, by T. A. Knight, Esq. 2*s*. 6*d*.
Egremont on the Mildew, 8vo. 2*s*.
Bartley on the Conversion of Grass Lands into Tillage; and on Potatoes, as food for sheep, 1*s*. 6*d*.
Boys on Paring and Burning, 6*s*.
Dalrymple on the Culture of Wheat, 3*s*.
Curtis's Practical Observations on British Grasses, 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.
Knapp's Specimens of British Grasses, with 120 plates, coloured, 4to. 8*l*. 8*s*.
Salisbury's Specimens of Grasses, 2 v. 8*l*. 8*s*.
Martyn's Flora Rustica, with figures of plants, either useful or injurious in Husbandry, 8vo. 1*l*. 4*s*.
Lord Dundonald, on the Connexion that subsists between Agriculture and Chemistry, containing a particular examination of the various substances used as manures, 4to. 10*s*. 6*d*.
Dr. Gibbes's Inquiry into the Nature and Properties of the different kinds of Manures, 2*s*.
Kirwan's Essay on the Manures most advantageously applicable to the different sorts of Earths, 2*s*.
Fordyce's Elements of Agriculture and Vegetation, 3*s*.
Home's Chemical Principles of Agriculture, 8vo. 5*s*.
Mills's Chemical Elements of Agriculture, 3*s*. 6*d*.
Darwin's Phytologia, or Philosophy of Agriculture, with Observations on Draining, and the Drill Plough, 4to. 1*l*. 11*s*. 6*d*.
Duhamel's Elements of Agriculture, 2 v. 8vo. 14*s*.
——— Practical Husbandry, 4to. with plates, 16*s*.
Lord Kaime's Gentleman Farmer, 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.
Munning's Experiments on Drilling and Protecting Turnips, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Stacy on the Cultivation of Turnips, 1*s*. 6*d*.
Treatise on the Culture of Potatoes, 1*s*.
Essay on the Culture of Hops, 3*s*.
Stickney's Observations respecting the Grub, 2*s*.
Boswell's Treatise on Watering Meadows, showing the method of performing the work, plates, 5*s*.
Tatham on National Irrigation, with plates, 8*s*.
Smith on Water Meadows, their Form, Utility, and Management, plates, 10*s*. 6*d*.
Amos's Theory and Practice of the Drill Husbandry, 10*s*. 6*d*.
Tull's Horse-hoeing Husbandry, 7*s*. 6*d*.
Bailey, on the Construction of the Plough, 2*s*.
Small on the Construction of Ploughs and Wheel Carriages, with plates, 8vo. 7*s*.
Gray's Ploughwright, a Treatise on Agricultural Implements, 15*s*.
Gray's Experienced Millwright, fol. 2*l*. 2*s*.
Smeaton on Wind and Water Mills, 5*s*.

ON STOCK.

Culley's Observations on Stock, with directions for choosing and improving the best Breeds of domestic Animals, a new edition, 6*s*.
Lawrence's General Treatise on Cattle, 10*s*. 6*d*.
The complete Grazier, with plates, 12*s*.
Garrard's Plates of the improved Breeds of British Cattle, published in numbers at 10*s*. 6*d*.
Harrison on the Rot in Sheep, and other Animals, 2*s*.
Coventry's Remarks on Stock, with Observations on Mr. Cline's directions for improving the Form of Animals, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Downing on the Disorders of Horned Cattle, 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.
Topham on the Diseases of Cattle, 7*s*.
Rowlin's complete Cow Doctor, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Lord Somerville's Facts respecting Sheep, Ploughs and Oxen, 4*s*.
Renton's Tables for computing the Weight of Cattle, by admeasurement, 2*s*. 6*d*.
Ainslie's Tables for the same, 1*s*.
Luccock on Wool, with Hints to the Grower for its improvement, 5*s*. 6*d*.
Bartley on extending the Growth of Merino Wool, 2*s*.
Dr. Parry's Observations on the practicability and advantage of producing in the British Isles fine Clothing Wool, equal to that of Spain, 5*s*.
Smith's Memoirs of Wool, 2 v. 1*l*. 11*s*. 6*d*.
Clarke on the Diseases of Horses, 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.
Burke's Anatomy of the Horse, 5*s*. 6*d*.
Lawrence on Horses, 2 v. 15*s*.
Boardman's Dictionary of the Veterinary Art, 4to. 2*l*. 12*s*. 6*d*.
Blaine's Outlines of the Veterinary Art, 2v. 1*l*. 5*s*.
Blaine on the Disorders of Dogs, 3*s*. 6*d*.
White's Compendium of the Veterinary Art, 2v. 11*s*.
Shipp on Diseases of the Horse, 1*l*. 1*s*.
Lawrence on the Structure and Animal Economy of the Horse, 8vo. 1*l*. 1*s*.
Coleman on the Horse's Foot, 2 v. 4to. with plates, 6*l*. 16*s*. 6*d*.
Hunter's Dictionary of Farriery, 8v. 6*s*.
Key's Bee Master's Assistant, 6*s*.
Wildman on the Management of Bees, 7*s*.
Huber on the Natural History of Bees, 5*s*. 6*d*.

PLANTING.

Evelyn's Silva, a Treatise on Forest Trees, and the Propagation of Timber, 4to. with plates, 2 v. 3*l*. 3*s*.
Boutcher on Forest Trees, Hedges, &c. 15*s*.
Marshall on Planting, and Rural Ornament, 2 v. 16*s*.
Nicol's Practical Planter, 6*s*.
Pontey's Profitable Planter, with plates
Pontey's Forest Pruner, a Treatise on the Management of British Timber, with plates, 12*s*.
Aikin's Woodland Companion, 8*s*.
Murray's British Garden, a Catalogue of hardy indigenous Plants, 2 v. 16*s*.

FRUIT TREES AND GARDENING.

Forsyth on the Culture of Fruit Trees, with plates, 8vo. 12*s*.
Knight on the Apple and Pear
Bucknall's Orchardist, 3*s*. 6*d*.
Speechley on the Culture of the Vine, 18*s*.
Speechley on the Pine, Grape, Peach, &c. 12*s*.
Kyle on the Management of the Peach and Nectarine, 3*s*.
Nicol's Forcing, Fruit, and Kitchen Gardener, 8*s*.
M'Phail's Gardener's Remembrancer, 8vo. 12*s*.
M'Phail on the Cultivation of the Cucumber, 8*s*.
Abercrombie on the Cultivation of the Garden Mushroom, 3*s*.
Mawe's Gardener's Kalendar, or General Directory for Kitchen and Fruit Garden, 7*s*. 6*d*.
Mawe's Universal Gardener and Botanist, 4to. 2*l*. 12*s*. 6*d*.
Marshall's Introduction to Gardening, with Hints on the Management of Fish Ponds, 5*s*.
Miller's Gardener and Botanist's Dictionary, 2v. folio, 10*l*.
Milne's Botanical Dictionary, 8vo. 15*s*.
Lee's Introduction to Botany, 7*s*. 6*d*.
Rousseau's Letters on Botany, 8*s*.
Martyn's Language of Botany, 7*s*.
Recreations in Gardening, &c. 2 v. 1*l*. 1*s*.

LANDSCAPE GARDENING, RURAL ARCHITECTURE, &c.

Repton's Sketches and Hints on Landscape Gardening, with plates, folio, coloured.
Repton's Observations on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening, folio, 5*l*. 5*s*.
Repton on the Changes of Taste in Landscape Gardening, 5*s*.
Wheatley's Observations on Modern Gardening, 4*s*.
Marshall's Essay on Landscape Gardening, 6*s*.
Loudon on Landscape Gardening, Planting, Embanking, &c. 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.
Loudon on the Construction of Hothouses, 12*s*.
Tod's Plans for Hothouses, Greenhouses, &c. 2*l*. 12*s*. 6*d*.
Loudon on forming, improving, and managing Country Residences, with plates, 2 v. 3*l*. 3*s*.
Decorations for Parks and Gardens, 10*s*. 6*d*.
Ideas for Rustic Furniture, 5*s*.

Middleton's Plans for Gates, Trellis Work, &c. 6*s.*
Parker's improved mode of Hanging Gates, 6*s.*
Barber's Instructions for building durable Walls composed wholly of Earth, with plates, 4to. 10*s.* 6*d.*
Atkinson's Plans for Cottages, 1*l.* 1*s.*
Wood's Plans of Labourers' Cottages, 15*s.*
Miller's Country Gentleman's Architect, 10*s.* 6*d.*
Gandy's Designs for Cottages, Farms, Villas, Entrance Gates, and Lodges, 4to. 2*l.* 2*s.*
Malton's Essay on British Cottage Architecture, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*
Lugar's Plans for Farms, Barns, Outhouses, &c. 1*l.* 5*s.*
Plaw's Fermé Ornée, or Rural Improvements, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*
Soane's Plans for Villas, with Designs for laying out Grounds, 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*
Lugar's Villas, in different styles of Architecture, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*
Elsam's Essay on Rural Architecture, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*
Gandy's Rural Architect, containing a great variety of Designs for Country Buildings, with Ground Plans, Descriptions and Estimates, 4to. 2*l.* 2*s.*

RURAL ECONOMY, &c.

Monk's Agricultural Dictionary, 3 v. 1*l.* 1*s.*
Gleanings from books on Agriculture and Gardening, 7*s.* 6*d.*
The Farmer's Cyclopædia, or Dictionary of Agriculture, 4to. with plates, 8 parts, 4*l.* 4*s.*
Edlin's Art of Bread Making, 4*s.*
Twamley's Complete Practice of Dairying and Cheese making, 2*s.*
The Art of making Cyder, 2*s.*
Combrune's Theory of Brewing, 8*s.*
Smith's complete Vermin Killer, with plates, 4*s.*
The Shepherd of Banbury's Rules for foretelling the Changes of the Weather, 1*s.* 6*d.*
Williams's Observations on the Climate of Great Britain, with Remarks on the effects of the weather upon the productions of the Soil, &c. &c. 8*s.*
Cato, concerning Agriculture, 8vo. 4*s.*
Varro's Three Books on Agriculture, 6*s.*
Agricultural Pursuits, translated from the Greek, 2 v. 18*s.*
Wimpey's Treatise on Rural Improvements, 7*s.*
Marshall on the Management of Landed Estates, 10*s.* 6*d.*
Lawrence's Modern Land Steward, 10*s.* 6*d.*
Bailey's Tables for purchasing and Renewing Leases, 6*s.*
Phillips on Inland Navigation, 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*
The Laws of Landlord and Tenant, 3*s.* 6*d.*
The Laws respecting Game, 1*s.* 6*d.*
The Laws of buying and selling Estates, 16*s.*
Laws respecting Commons, Wastes, and Inclosures, 3*s.*
Plowden's Principle and Law of Tithes, 16*s.*
Bearblock on Tithes, with the various modes of compounding, and an estimate of every titheable article in common cultivation, 8vo. 5*s.*
The Laws respecting the Poor, 5*s.*
Dirom on the Corn Laws, 12*s.*
Smith's Tracts on the Corn Laws, 1*l.* 1*s.*
Becket's Treatise on Land Surveying, 8*s.*
Scale's Tables for valuing Estates, 5*s.*
Cullyer's Tables for the use of Farmers, Millers, Thatchers, and others, for measuring Land, &c. 2*s.* 6*d.*
Francis's Tables for measuring, and expeditiously computing the Value of Land, &c. 2*s.* 6*d.*
The Farmer's Daily Journal, 4to. 7*s.*
The Farmer's Account Book, for 1807, ruled, for keeping a journal of occurrences and daily accounts of Stock of every description, of Labour performed, of Receipts and Expenses, and the various other transactions of a Farm, folio, containing 52 Weeks Accounts, printed on writing paper, 1*l.* 1*s.*—to be continued annually.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Communications to the Board of Agriculture, on subjects relating to Husbandry, and the internal improvement of the Country, with plates, plans, &c. &c. 5 v. 4*l.* 13*s.*
Agricultural Surveys of the principal Counties in England, detailing the practice of the various branches of Husbandry peculiar to each, with Observations on the means of improvement, illustrated by maps, plans, views, &c. &c.—the Work consists of about 20 v. and is drawn up and published under the authority of the Board of Agriculture.
Marshall's View of the Rural Economy of the six principal Agricultural Departments, 14 v.
The Bath Agricultural Society's Letters and Papers on Agriculture and Rural Economy, 10 v. 5*l.* 5*s.*
Transactions of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Agriculture, 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*
The Highland Society's Prize Essays on Agriculture, and Relative Subjects, 2 v. 16*s.*
Hunter's Georgical Essays, with plates, 6 v. 3*l.* 3*s.*
Young's Annals of Agriculture, and other useful Arts, published periodically, 2*s.* 6*d.*
The Farmer's Magazine, consisting of original papers and tracts on Agriculture and Rural affairs, published periodically, 2*s.* 6*d.* 7 v. (already published) 3*l.* 4*s.* 6*d.*
The Agricultural Magazine, published monthly, 1*s.* 6*d.* 14 v. (already published) 6*l.* 6*s.*
Anderson's Rural Recreations, 6 v. 3*l.* 12*s.*
Anderson's Essays on Agriculture and Rural Affairs, 3 v. 1*l.* 7*s.*

This Day is published,

Printed on Writing Paper, in Folio, price 1*l.* 1*s.*

THE

FARMER'S ACCOUNT BOOK,

FOR 1807.

PRINTED FOR J. HARDING,

No. 36, St. James's Street, London.

Sold by CONSTABLE and Co. Edinburgh; BRASH and REID, Glasgow; TODD, YORK; and all other Booksellers.

PLAN OF THE WORK.

The Work is divided into Fifty-two Weekly Accounts, and the First Six Pages of it are filled up as a Specimen of the mode in which the Accounts are to be kept.

Page 1—Is a JOURNAL, in which the occurrences of each Day are to be minuted down, as in the printed Example. The line at the top of the leaf is intended for the date when the account commences;—and here it may be observed, that the best time to begin is at Michaelmas, when the Farmer's Year may with propriety be said to commence. However, the account may be opened at any period of the year, and the date must be inserted accordingly.

Pages 2 and 3—Are intended for an ACCOUNT of LABOUR, by which may be seen, at one View, what Men and Horses are employed; on what Work, and the price per day.—At the bottom of the page is a space to contain the particulars of *Task Work*. For the convenience of keeping this Account, and for all the purposes of communication with their Bailiff or Steward, Gentlemen would find it very useful to have Plans made of their Farms, and to distinguish the different Fields by Numbers, as is done in the printed Example.

Page 4—Is a Statement of EXPENSES and RECEIPTS on the Farm for one week, and into this Account every Receipt or Disbursement is to be entered.—Thus it appears in the Journal, Page 1, that a Load of Wheat was *sold* for 20*l.* This sum is accordingly brought forward into the Account of the Week's *Receipt*, whilst the amount of five Ewes, *purchased* for 7*l.* 10*s.* (page 1,) and the sum *paid* for Labour (in page 3) are carried to the opposite side, or *Expense* Account: and thus every Receipt or Disbursement is to be entered on its respective side of the Account.

Page 5—Is intended to keep a memorandum of any part of the Farm that may be occupied by Cattle, which will be found useful for several purposes. The lower part of this page contains a Week's Account of CORN, HAY, POTATOES, &c. whether Bought, Threshed, Sown, Sold, or Consumed.

Page 6—Is for the Convenience of showing the INCREASE or DECREASE of LIVE STOCK; it explains itself, and will be found very useful.——On the same leaf is an ACCOUNT of MILK and BUTTER, which requires no explanation.

Page 7—Contains an account of the STOCK of CORN, HAY, &c. IN HAND BEFORE AND AFTER HARVEST, which is necessary to complete the Year's Account of Produce.

Pages 8 and 9—Show the YEARLY ACCOUNT of the FARM.—Into this account all the weekly amounts of Receipts and Expenses must be entered; thus the 10*l.* 11s. placed to the Dr. side of the Account in the printed Specimen, is the amount of *Expenses* of the first Week, (brought from page 4) and the 21*l.* 15*s.* 9*d* is, in like manner brought forward as the *Receipts* of the same period; at the End of the Year both sides will be added up, and the Profit or Loss ascertained.

N. B.—This Publication will be found particularly useful by those Gentlemen who, when absent from home, are in the practice of requiring from their Bailiff or Steward an Account of what is doing upon the Estate; and with this View it may be had in detached Sheets, for the convenience of transmission by post.—The favour of any suggestion for the Improvement of the Work, *as it is intended to be continued annually*, will be thankfully received and acknowledged by the Publisher, J. HARDING, 36, St. James's Street, London.

AGRICULTURAL BOOKS

PRINTED FOR J. HARDING,

36, ST. JAMES'S-STREET, LONDON.

This Day is published, in One Volume Royal Quarto, Price 2l. 2s. Boards,

THE RURAL ARCHITECT;

CONSISTING OF VARIOUS

DESIGNS FOR COUNTRY BUILDINGS;

ACCOMPANIED WITH

GROUND-PLANS, ESTIMATES, AND DESCRIPTIONS.

By JOSEPH GANDY, Architect, A. R. A.
Author of "Designs for Cottages," &c.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

Cottages of the most simple form and economical construction—House of Business, or Office, as suggested by Mr. MARSHALL—Dairies—A mill—Group of thirteen Cottages, designed for the neighbourhood of a Manufactory—Gardener's Cottage—Bath—Several double Cottages—Cottages for three, four, and five Families—Ornamental Cottages—Plan of a Manufactory and Work-shops—Groups of Cottages, designed upon a principle of exciting emulation and rewarding meritorious exertion—Habitation for an Overseer of Labourers—Arable, Dairy, and Grazing Farms—An Inn—Villas, and small Country Dwellings—Entrance-gates—Single and double Lodges, &c. &c. &c.—A Rural Institute, or National Establishment, for the advancement of Agriculture, on Mr. MARSHALL's plan.

In the Press,

1. An AGRICULTURAL EXCURSION in IRELAND, with an Account of Two Years successful Farming in that Country. By RICHARD PARKINSON, Author of the "Experienced Farmer," and "Farmer's Tour in America."
2. A TREATISE on WOOL, comprising a particular Account of its essential Qualities and Defects, and pointing out the Objects to be attended to by the Grower, with a view to the Improvement of the British Fleece. By JOHN LUCCOCK, Woolstapler.
3. A CATALOGUE of BOOKS on AGRICULTURE and RURAL ECONOMY; including some Authors on POLITICAL ECONOMY, and the ARTS, more immediately relating to RURAL AFFAIRS.

Printed by B. McMillan, Bow-Street, Covent-Garden.

Agricultural Books lately published for J. HARDING, *London.*

1. ALDERSON's ESSAY on the IMPROVEMENT OF POOR SOILS. 8vo. 2s.
2. SIR JOSEPH BANKS's SHORT ACCOUNT of the DISEASE in CORN, called, by Farmers, the BLIGHT, the MILDEW, and the RUST; with a Plate. Price 2s.
3. BARTLEY (Secretary to the Bath Society) on the Conversion of PASTURE LAND into TILLAGE—on the MANUFACTURE of POTATOES into STARCH—and on the utility of applying POTATOES as FOOD for SHEEP. 1s. 6d.
4. BARTLEY's LETTERS on Extending the GROWTH of FINE CLOTHING WOOL, by INTERBREEDING with SPANISH RAMS and BRITISH EWES. 2s.
5. BARBER's FARM-BUILDINGS, or RURAL ECONOMY; containing a minute Description of the Mode of Building in Pisé. 4to. 6 Plates. 10s. 6d.
6. CULLEY's OBSERVATIONS on LIVE STOCK, with Directions for choosing and improving the best Breeds of Domestic Animals, with Plates. 8vo. New Edition. Price 6s.
7. The EARL of DUNDONALD's TREATISE; shewing the intimate Connexion that subsists between Agriculture and Chemistry: addressed to the Cultivators of the Soil. 4to. 10s. 6d.
8. GARRARD's PLATES, descriptive of the Improved Breeds of British Cattle, folio.
9. HARRISON on the ROT in SHEEP, and other Animals. 8vo. 2s.
10. MARSHALL's RURAL ECONOMY of the WEST of ENGLAND. A new and enlarged Edition, 8vo. 2 vols. 15s.
11. PARKINSON's EXPERIENCED FARMER, embracing the whole SYSTEM of AGRICULTURE, BREEDING, &c. 2 vols. 1l. 1s.
12. PARKINSON's TOUR in AMERICA, in 1798, 1799, and 1800, giving a particular Account of the American System of Husbandry, &c. &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.
13. A PRACTICAL and EXPERIMENTAL INQUIRY into the NATURE and PROPERTIES of the DIFFERENT KINDS of MANURES. 2s.
14. STICKNEY's OBSERVATIONS respecting the GRUB. 8vo. 2s.
15. The GAME BOOK; enabling the Sportsman to keep an Account of Game, when and where killed, and other Particulars, in the manner of a Journal. 7s. 1l. 1s. or 2l. 2s.

Lately published by J. HARDING, *in Royal Quarto, with* 43 *Plates, price* 2*l.* 2*s.*

DESIGNS
FOR COTTAGES, COTTAGE FARMS, *AND OTHER RURAL BUILDINGS*;
INCLUDING ENTRANCE-GATES AND LODGES.

By JOSEPH GANDY, Architect, A. R. A.

This Volume will prove useful to Architects and Gentlemen who build on their Estates, as it contains a great variety of COUNTRY BUILDINGS, designed in a style of peculiar beauty, and possessing every advantage of interior accommodation and economical arrangement. Each Plate is accompanied with a Ground Plan, Estimate, and Letter-press Descriptions.

CONTENTS.

Plate 1. A Cottage of one room, for a Labourer, Gate-keeper, &c. 2. Another. 3. A Cottage, with conveniences for keeping Pigs, &c. 4. Ditto of two rooms, intended for a Park. 5. A double Cottage. 6. A Cottage for a Labourer who keeps a Cow, &c. 7. Another. 8. Ditto, of two rooms. 9. Ditto, with a bed-room above stairs. 10. An ornamental Cottage for a Gentleman's Grounds. 11. Cottage, with bed-rooms above. 12. Cottage, with Cow-house, &c. under one roof. 13. Ornamental Cottage for a Park. 14. A Cottage-dwelling of two rooms. 15. Picturesque Cottage for a Shepherd. 16. Cottage and Bridge. 17. Country Residence, with bed-rooms above. 18. Plan for two or four Cottages on the banks of a river, and sketch for a Bridge. 19. Picturesque Farm-dwelling. 20. A small Country Residence. 21. A Cottager's Dwelling. 22. A Green-house and Conservatory, with residence for the Gardener. 23. A Farrier's Shop, with Stables and Habitation annexed. 24. A Picturesque Cottage of three Rooms. 25. A Cottage of three rooms. 26. Habitation near a Market-town. 27. A Picturesque Building designed for a Public-house. 28. Residence for a Market-town. 29. A double Cottage, with conveniences for Farming. 30. Picturesque double Cottage. 31. A small Farm. 32. A Picturesque Farm-dwelling. 33. A Grazing Farm. 34. Gentleman's Farming Residence. 35. Circular group of eight Cottages. 36. Plan for a Village. 37. A Country Residence or Hunting Box. 38. A double Lodge, and arched entrance to a Park. 39. Circular single Lodge and Gate. 40. Single Lodge and Covered-way. 41. A double Lodge, consisting of thatched Cones. 42. A Lodge with Octagon Piers and Ornaments. 43. A Lodge and Arched Gateway.

Lately published, for J. HARDING, *St. James's-Street, London.*

1. PICTURESQUE EXCURSIONS in DEVONSHIRE. By T. H. WILLIAMS, Plymouth. Illustrated with 27 Views, drawn and etched by the Author. In royal 8vo. Price 1l. 8s. boards.

The object of this Work is to give slight Sketches of the most striking Scenery in the County of Devon, accompanied with a Description of the most remarkable Places, and their Inhabitants. In this plan he has certainly succeeded. Many of the Sketches are most beautifully executed, and the Work must prove a valuable present to the Lovers of Painting and fine Scenery, and to those who may reside in or visit Devonshire.—*Literary Journal, October*, 1804.

2. DRUNKEN BARNABY's FOUR JOURNEYS to the NORTH of ENGLAND, in Latin and English Metre. A new Edition, with 7 Plates. Price 7s. boards; or, large paper, 12s.

This is a republication of a curious little Work, originally printed in the 16th century. The Author, whoever he was, shews himself acquainted with the History, Antiquities, and Customs of every place he visits, and exhibits so much acuteness of remark, and keenness of satire, that he is evidently a Drunkard, merely in masquerade.

3. A DICTIONARY of PAINTERS, from the Revival of the Art to the present period. By the Rev. M. PILKINGTON, A. M. A new Edition, with considerable Alterations and Additions, by HENRY FUSELI, R. A. 4to. Price 1l. 16s.; or, large paper, 2l. 12s. 6d.

4. THE POEMS of OSSIAN; a new and beautiful Edition, embellished with twelve Engravings by FITTLER, from Paintings by SINGLETON, 3 vols. foolscap 8vo. Price 1l. 1s. boards; or, on large paper, 1l. 16s.

5. THE DANCE of DEATH; represented in 30 Plates, painted by HOLBEIN, and engraved by HOLLAR, in 1 vol. foolscap 8vo. Price 10s. 6d.—large 8vo. 15s.—or in 4to. 1l. 1s. boards.

In the early ages of Christianity, it was the practice to represent the fallacy of worldly pleasures, and the transitory nature of all our pursuits, by exhibiting upon the walls of the churches, and in other situations, several figures carried away by Skeletons or *Deaths*, in the midst of their amusements and occupations. Of this kind is the Dance of Death, painted by HOLBEIN, and engraved by HOLLAR, in the sixteenth century. The Plates in this very curious and interesting Publication, thirty in number, are from the *original Coppers etched by* HOLLAR, and some of the subjects are very beautiful.—*Literary Journal, June*, 1804.

6. ELEMENTS of SCIENCE and ART; being a familiar Introduction to NATURAL PHILOSOPHY and CHEMISTRY: together with their Application to a variety of elegant and useful Arts. By JOHN IMISON. A new Edition, considerably enlarged and improved. In 2 large vols. 8vo.; with an Index, and 32 Engravings by LOWRY. Price 1l. 5s. boards.

The first edition of this Work was reviewed by us in our 72d vol.; but it is now so greatly enlarged, that we have reviewed it as a new production; and we think its merits are considerable. There is very little in SCIENCE and ART, which the Author does not touch upon; much, therefore, evidently cannot be said upon each, but what is given is stated properly and judiciously. Its multifarious information must render this compilation useful and entertaining. —*Monthly Rev. Sept.* 1804.

Printed by B. M'Millan, Bow-Street, Covent-Garden.

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München

M/6x/H

Kruis

BSB Bayerische StaatsBibliothek
MDZ Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum Digitale Bibliothek

Parnell, William

An historical Apology for the Irish Catholics

Dublin 1807
Brit. 427 g
urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10281256-1